

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXX.

BALTIMORE, FEBRUARY, 1915.

No. 2.

ON R. H. HORNE'S *ORION*

Horne's *Orion* is one of the best instances to show how Keats's allegoric way of handling a Greek fable was intimately responsive to the æsthetic ideals of an age fond of a kind of poetry which might adorn subtle, metaphysic conceptions with the radiance of a sumptuous imagery. Keats tried to express the passion and mystery of life by means of symbols derived from an Hellenic legend, and Horne used the same artifice to manifest his theories; the latter, however, goes even farther on this philosophic track, and we find in him a strong tendency to transcendentalism. Allowing for the difference of race and genius, we may say that Horne's method when composing *Orion* was rather akin to the system followed by Novalis when writing *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*. The myth of Orion is to him an allegory of the elevation of the soul from earthly passions to pure, eternal love; his fate is to rise, through hard ordeals, from the mire of a brutish life to the effulgence of heaven, to acquire wisdom through sorrow, and, at last, to pass away from earth and to shine, forever young, in the temple of Night blazing with immortal stars;

rising still

With nightly brilliance, merging in the dawn,—
And circling onward in eternal youth.¹

Orion is a symbol of bold, struggling, ever aspiring life; he likes conflict and strife, he tastes a fierce delight in the battle against the gigantic powers of nature; Orion, the builder, the monster-fighter, is the emblem of the indefatigable energy of man, seeking ardently, anxiously, on the dark sea of Life, for the land of supreme, perfect bliss, for the Land of heart's desire. We see him surrounded by the allegorical forms of his giant brothers: Akinetos, the symbol of self-destroying wisdom, living a strange life in the barren land of Inertia, in-

stead of breaking through the forest of Doubt and reaching the glorious fields, where the golden fruits of Fame glitter among clustering flowers,—Rhexergon, the destroyer,—Hormetes, following his wayward impulses, careless of reason,—Harpax, "in rapine taking huge delight,"—Biastor, the emblem of strength without a ruling mind,—Encolyon, the subtly reasoner, the craftiest man in arguing,

in all things slow,

The dull retarder, chainer of the wheel.

But Orion, unlike Akinetos, possesses an active wisdom, not a passive one; he knows that hard trials and painful labor are not suffered in vain; unlike Rhexergon and Harpax, he is endowed with sublime aspirations and does not indulge in low pleasures and the cruel ecstasy of slaughter. What mainly distinguishes Orion from his brothers is his spiritual power, his faculty of conceiving dreams superior in beauty and splendor to material things; he is indeed the type of the dreamer, the Shadows-hunter, pursuing bright visions, radiant ideals of goodness, of love, of truth. He perceives the harmony of a sphere,—the sphere of spiritual beauty,—ringing with music, revolving around the earth; through the golden and black pattern woven in the wood by the sunlight, he descries flowers brighter than those springing from the darkness of the ground, gems more refulgent than the colored crystals broken from the rocks, trees of a deeper green, birds with wings of amethyst and fire. Orion has to pierce through the wall of matter in order to reach his aim; and threefold is the symbol of nature: Artemis symbolizes the mystery of nature, Merope, the tragedy of the blind forces of the world, Eos the divine glow of perfect beauty. Artemis allures him to weird, fascinating, haunting visions; crowned with the black poppies of sleep, he tries to forget his power, his proud ambitions, his glorious goal; lying on the misty shore of the violet lake of dreamland, he drinks the influence of nature as a magic

¹ P. 158 [London, Chatto and Windus, 1874].

philtre; he sees the world aureoled with fairy rays spreading out into mysterious gloom; there is sublimity in every feature of the landscape, but there is also a mystic terror preventing love and comprehension. His dreams disappear into the cold darkness, their rainbow light fading into grey mists; having first flooded his soul with ardent longings they leave behind a heavy, dull melancholy, an inert sadness. Yet Artemis's influence is not without good, as it spiritualizes his wishes, subduing the violence of his temper; and now he is seeking untrodden paths, his lonely heart burning with a strange, unearthly love, while his friends lie weltering in muddy pleasures. Merope then bestows upon him a wonderful, though fallacious, strength, and drags him to terrible ordeals; we see the daring hero rushing down the terraced hillside, waving blazing pines as torches, driving to the surging sea the herds of wild beasts, breaking, mad with terror, from bush and thicket, the trees snapping under their struggling bulks. Blindness falls upon him as a dark crowd of shapeless ghosts; the grasp of Sorrow is tightening around his heart; he sinks in despair, his giant brothers mocking, despising him; but, at last, through the eager, earnest aspirations of his soul, craving for light and love and peace, the sinister vapors arise; the dawn unfolds a glittering flower in the environing gloom, and he again desires the reed-shadowed pools of the forest, looking like mirrors of burnished copper set in green frames of twisted creepers. Eos opens a new world to his soul still trembling with pain and dismay; she admits him into her palace of gold, the Temple of Mercy and Goodness; the eternal splendor pervades his heart; he sees the crown of pale roses and pearls gleam on the forehead of Eos, among the fading stars; Artemis and the goddess of Dawn join in an ardent prayer to Jove, and Orion is endowed with immortal life.

Horne's feeling of natural beauty is sincere and deep; it is in descriptions of landscapes that his glorious imagination is seen at its best; in painting his ideal scenery he lavishes in sumptuous accords the brilliant tints, the translucent shades, the striking effects of light and shadow which haunt his fervid fantasy. He is

particularly fond of contrasts; in his pictures the silvery grace of lilies blooms near the gloomy marsh, the peace of cornfields, streaked with the pale gold of the April sun and violet, thin shadows, ends into the weird darkness of a rocky valley; strange, uncouth forms are lurking in the thickets, ruddy with the autumnal bronze, loud with the songs of fairy birds. To him Nature is at once magnificent and tremendous; his emotion is alike that of the first men when they beheld an island, blue with the dawn mists, arise from the sea, a land of wonders, a dwelling of monsters and creatures divine. His mind is haunted by visions of primeval woods, by the aspect of a forest (pp. 71-72),

old as the earth,
 . . . lofty in its glooms,
 When the sun hung o'erhead, and, in its darkness,
 Like Night, . . .
 . . . where the night-black spires
 Of pines begin to swing, and breathe a dirge,

by visions of huge stems, looming ghostly, as gigantic snakes entangled in a deadly struggle, their dishevelled branches yelling in the blast, by the appearance of dark floods rushing from the mouths of caves, an uprooted tree emerging as a black octopus from the foaming whirlpool. And he likes to see the forces of nature set free from the veil which darkens them to our eyes; his giants are the personifications of such powerful agencies as we find in a tempest, in the driving clouds of a hurricane, in the fires of lightnings. No passage of the poem can better convey the idea of awe and grandeur, of beauty and terror conceived by Horne than the picture of dragons dying in the waves (pp. 71-72):

through dark fens,
 Marshes, green rushy swamps, and margins reedy,
 Orion held his way,—and *rolling shapes*
 Of serpent and of dragon moved before him
 With high-reared crests, *swan-like yet terrible*,
 And often looking back *with gem-like eyes*.

. . . The living mass,
 Dark heaving o'er the waves resistlessly,
 At length, in distance, seemed a circle small,
 Midst which one creature in the centre rose,
Conspicuous in the long red quivering gleams
 That from the dying brands streamed o'er the waves.

It was the oldest dragon of the fens, . . .
 And now he rose up, like an embodied curse
 From all the doomed, fast sinking.

While Keats and Shelley aimed rather at depicting the glorious smile of the Ocean, its blue and green grottos of lapislazuli and malachite, its purple shadows broken by glancing reflections, Horne tried to convey its stern grandeur, its sullen sleep (p. 95):

And passing round between two swelling slopes
 Of green and golden light, beheld afar
 The broad grey horizontal wall o' the dead-calm sea.

The eternal Sea
 Before him passively at full length lay,
 As in a dream of the uranian Heavens.

He paints with phosphoric tints the moon-light effects, the landscape spell-bound under the radiance of the moon, as of a fairy lamp hanging from a purple dome; the opal paleness of the moon draws a visionary veil over the world; its pearly light, blurring reality, fills him with a mystic spleen, with inexplicable sadness (pp. 116, 15).

Fast through the clouds retiring, the pale orb
 Of Artemis a moment seemed to hang
 Suspended in a halo, phantom-like,
 Over a restless sea of jasper fire.

. . . Above the isle of Chios
 The clear moon lingered . . . but chiefly sought
 With melancholy splendour to illumine
 The dark-mouthed caverns where Orion lay
 Dreaming. . . .

There seems to be apparently a striking affinity between Keats and Horne; yet this similarity is rather a shallow one, and looking deeper into their artistic tempers we descry wide differences both in their ground ideas and in their tendencies. We never find in Horne's poem the dejection and the despair of the *Ode to a Nightingale*, the bitter smile of *Hyperion*; though his sense of beauty is far less keen than Keats's, Horne is endowed with a healthier view of life and with a strong faith as to the results of the struggle for the triumph of a noble ideal; we can trace in *Orion* a more profound conception of existence than in *Endymion*, and

consequently we are impressed by a deeper meaning in the allegories. While Keats likes to while away the dreamy hours lying under a bower of crimson roses,—stirred now and then into a soft rustle by a spicy breeze,—rapt in a melancholy trance, Horne is fond of active life, of movement and fighting. While reading *Lamia* and the *Ode to Melancholy* we seem to wander in an autumnal wood, all red and gold, looking at bright pageants passing in the blue hazy distance, a strange languor stealing into our soul; we enjoy in *Orion* the rousing feeling of heroic bravery, of undaunted valor. Keats's poetical vision of the universe is dimmed by the dazzling radiance of exterior beauty; Horne endeavors at least to pierce through the glistening veil and perceive the inmost essence of things; at any rate, and whatever his attainments, he likes better to convey the feeling of a landscape, rather than the sensation produced by lines and colors, as Keats would do. This statement might be supported by many instances, among which I shall choose the most characteristic.

From the great repose
 What echoes now float on the listening air? . . .
 . . . 'Tis Artemis come
 With all her buskined Nymphs and sylvan rout,
 To scare the silence and the sacred shades,
 And with dim music break their rapturous trance.
 (p. 4.)

. . . with averted face—
 As gazing down the woodland vista slopes,
 Which oft her bright orb silvered through black shades
 When midnight throbbed to silence—Artemis asked,
 (p. 11.)

Keats's poetry reflects as a magic sphere the shifting hues of his fantasies; Horne's poem mirrors in its dark waters the mystery and passion, the beauty and sorrow of human life. It must be owned, however, that in Horne's treatment of landscape we have unmistakable traces of Keats's influence; we meet with that dewy freshness, with that summer luxuriance, with that sad glitter of nostalgic visions, which are peculiar features of Keats's art. We have in the following passage the queer invention, the quaint fancy which so often strike us in *Endymion* (pp. 68-69):

He approached
And found the spot . . . was now arrayed
With many-headed poppies, like a crowd
Of dusky Ethiops in a magic cirque,
Which had sprung up . . . in the night
And all entranced the air.

And here we have the mellow radiance of
Keats's palette (p. 131):

Morn comes at first with white uncertain light;
Then takes a faint red, like an opening bud
Seen through grey mist; . . .
the sky . . . takes a crimson flush,
Puts forth bright sprigs of gold, which soon expanding
In saffron, then pure golden shines the morn;
Uplifts its clear bright fabric of white clouds,
All tinted, like a shell of polished pearl,
With varied glancings, violet gleam and blush.

To find passages fit to compare with the
following lines in glorious refulgence of trans-
lucid hues we must turn to Shelley (p. 119):

Against a sky
Of delicate purple, snow-bright courts and halls,
Touched with light silvery green, gleaming across,
Fronted by pillars vast, cloud-capitalled,
With shafts of changeful pearl, all reared upon
An isle of clear aerial gold, came floating;
And in the centre, clad in fleecy white,
With lucid lilies in her golden hair,
Eos, sweet goddess of the Morning, stood.

Following the example of Keats and Shelley,
he adopted a Greek myth as argument to his
song; the sunlit beach of the Hellenic land had
an irresistible glamour for these souls yearning
towards a luminous scenery and an heroic
people; side by side with the somber Druid oak
of Gothic art there grew in England the fra-
grant, blossoming laurel of Greek inspiration;
yet both were thriving in the garden of Roman-
ticism. Therefore the Hellenic fables assumed
a new coloring, acquired a strange, intense life
in these Northern minds; it was not till later
on that William Morris and Charles Algernon
Swinburne dealt with Hellenic arguments in
the true Hellenic spirit. We find in *Orion* a
morbid pathos unknown to the Dorian play-
wrights; we observe in Artemis, in Eos, a ro-
mantic melancholy more akin to the dreamy
ecstasy pervading Wordsworth's poetry than to
the tragic grandeur of Aeschylus's sadness.

Likewise the personifications of natural forces
in *Orion* look rather similar to the weird, wild
figures of the *Edda*, than to the serene and
stately forms engendered by a classical im-
agination. We must remark that while the
poet of *Endymion* is inclined to graceful repre-
sentations of nature, to paint fantastic figures
seen in emerald and violet lights, playing with
gems in the caves of Cybeles, or dancing under
the rainbow arch in Neptune's halls, Horne
derives peculiar effects of gloomy grandeur
from a rugged scenery, rather dwelling on the
mystery of a black tarn, lying motionless and
dismal between the beetling walls of rock, than
on the orange and blue flowers enamelling the
patches of grass in the mountain landscape.

The diction, though far from the vividness
and elegance of Keats, is forcible; the rich and
flowing language is vigorously handled; the
passions of mankind and the struggling forces
of nature mingle and blend in this poem, so
that we feel, pulsing through the lines, the
throbbing of intense life. Notwithstanding the
variety of his expressions, by which he tries to
adapt his utterance to the different moods of
his personages and to the divers aspects of the
ambiance,—the terror of storm, the gladness
of the green wood, the tragedy of clouds rent
by lightnings, the sadness of the leafless bough,
—there is a remarkable unity of tone in his
style, all the different rhythms merging into a
solemn, impressive song, as the themes join
and develop in beautiful accord in a symphony.
His workmanship is always refined and effec-
tive, either in rendering the sombre pageant of
the clouds, or in portraying the most peaceful
and serene moods of nature, as the noon still-
ness.² Endowed with a fierce energy of con-

² Now came the snorting and intolerant steeds
Of the Sun's chariot tow'ds the summer signs;

. . .
And cleared the heavens, but held the vapours
there,

In cloudy architecture of all hues.

The stately fabrics and the Eastern pomps,
Tents, tombs, processions veiled, and temples vast,
Remained not long in their august repose,
But sank to ruins, and re-formed in likeness
Of monstrous beasts in lands and seas unknown.

(Book II, Canto III, p. 83.)

ception, he was naturally fond of broad outlines, of vivid colors; and yet—his classical taste teaching him a careful self-restraint, a forcible concentration,—we find in his verse a Greek subtlety of epithets, conveying the genuine perception through the refracting medium of an exquisite, quickening, truly poetical imagination.⁸ In considering whether the poet has bestowed upon his fantastic scenes that sense of reality which is the best test of the power of representation, we should turn to details, since they afford the easiest way of analyzing the artist's technique. In Horne we meet with a striking realism in the particulars of his descriptions, a realism which reveals in him a rare, keen faculty of observation; he possesses that sharpness of æsthetic insight and that delicacy of perception which find out immediately the most characteristic features of the landscape or figure looked at; and his remarkable mastery over the language enables him to alight at once on the right word, or turn of phrase, to express an attitude, a movement, a peculiar sound, a shade of color. Let us observe for example the life-like posture of the Sylvens in Artemis's train, waiting for the dance:

And Sylvens, who, half Faun, half shepherd, lead
A grassy life, with cymbals in each hand
Pressed cross-wise on the breast, waiting the sign;

Not a breeze came o'er the edge
Of the high-heaving fields and fallow lands;
Only the zephyrs at long intervals
Drew a deep sigh, as of some blissful thought,
Then swooned to silence. Not a bird was seen
Nor heard: all marble gleamed the steadfast sky.
(p. 95.)

See Poe's remarks on Horne's technique: "Horne has a very peculiar and very delightful faculty of enforcing, or giving vitality to a picture, by some over vivid and intensely characteristic point or touch. He seizes the most salient feature of his theme, and makes this feature convey the whole."—*Works*. The Fordham Edition, Vol. V, p. 494.

* . . . ye mountains waving brown
With *thick-winged woods*, . . .
. . . what odours and what sighs
Tend your sweet silence through the *star-showered*
night, . . . (Book I, Canto I.)

or the stag bounding away, released from Orion's grasp:

The Giant lowered his arm—away the stag
Breast forward plunged into a thicket near;

the loud crackling of trees a-fire:

Orion grasped
Two blazing boughs; one high in air he raised,
The other *with its roaring foliage* trailed
Behind him as he sped;

and the hues of dawn:

Of when dawn
With a *grave red* looked through the *ash-pale*
woods, . . . (pp. 24, 8, 72, 23.)

Horne has a fine sense of color, both for shifting, delusive *nuances* and bold, glaring hues; we can contrast the notations of the changing purple of snows at sunrise, of green shadows becoming suffused with golden light, of the violet rift in the clouds where appears the high moon, with the glittering image of the woods "all with golden fires alive" at noon, or the opal radiance of Eos's apparition.

Far in the distance, gleaming like the bloom
Of almond-trees seen through long floating halls
Of pale ethereal blue and virgin gold,
A Goddess, smiling like a new-blown flower,
Orion saw. (pp. 3, 57, 68, 27, 117.)

Sometimes he makes the colors stand out with a strange elegance from the background, as in the hunting scene in Book II, adorned with the crude, brilliant dyes of a Flemish tapestry of the fifteenth century.

The hounds with tongues
Crimson, and lolling hot upon the green,
And outstretched noses, flatly crouched; their skins
Clouded or spotted, like the field-bean's flower,
Or tiger-lily, painted the wide lawns. (p. 27.)

His fantasy is at the same time subtle and daring; Hephaistos's hall [Book I, C. I.] and Orion's dream [Book III, C. I.] show a super-refinement and an audacity of imagination which are only to be found in Robert Browning and Meredith; while he reveals a perfect con-

trol over his imaginative faculty by his capacity of checking the impulse, which would at last substitute the *bizarre* to the *beautiful*. Moreover the lucidity of his descriptions is the best test of his creative power, which, combined with a vigorous and suggestive form, succeeds in bringing before the inward eye the ideal vision as sharply defined as reality itself. The vividness of the following passage will suffice to support our statement.

They loitered near the founts that sprang elate
Into the dazzled air, or pouring rolled
A crystal torrent into oval shapes
Of blood-veined marble; and oft gazed within
Profoundly tranquil and secluded pools,
Whose lovely depths of mirrored blackness clear—
Oblivion's lucid-surfaced mystery—
Their earnest eyes revealed.⁴

In a passage of the Book II [Canto I, p. 57]⁵ we have a curious instance of that blending of the soul's visions with the real scene, of that intimate union of feeling and sensation, which the French symbolists were, and are, so fond of. Yet a sense of obscurity would very often arise from this emblematic writing, so subjective and personal; therefore Horne turned to mythology as the only way to conciliate his tendency for allegory and the perspicuity of his verse. He was well aware that mythology was a forest of symbols through which any reader could wander at will with-

out fear of losing his way; the classical fables afforded him the opportunity of using allegories already endowed with a definite meaning, and shaped with an exquisite sense of beauty. Nevertheless he was not satisfied with adopting the Greek myths without any change, and thus we find in his poem original symbols and mythologic figures strangely alive with a new fervor of life, as in Chapman and Keats,—enriched with a depth of meaning and a mystic radiance, of which the ancient artists never had the remotest idea.⁶ What gives Horne's lines their suggestive power is a vivid sense of the enigmatic, impassioned beauty of life; there is, for instance, in Merope's figure a strange, intense sadness, and in her eyes a deep vision of Sorrow and Fate, as in one of those sinister and beautiful faces painted by Rossetti, as in those visages evoked by Swinburne with rimes haunting and mournful as an incantation.

Dark were her eyes, and beautiful as Death's
With a mysterious meaning, such as lurks
In that pale ecstasy, the Queen of Shades.

All his artistic faculties converge to produce this effect of life, so that even its most meta-

⁵ See the lines at p. 6:

Hunter of Shadows, thou thyself a shade, . . .

and the development of this conception at p. 23:

. . . a restless dream

Dawned on his soul which he desired to shape;

beside, the mystic mood due to Artemis's influence [Book I, Canto III]. The same conception of mythology we find in Maurice de Guérin, though in the author of *Le Centaure*, as Matthew Arnold says: "the natural magic is perfect. . . . He has a truly interpretative faculty; the most profound and delicate sense of the life of Nature, and the most exquisite felicity in finding expressions to render that sense" [*Essays in Criticism*, I Series. Macmillan, 1905, p. 85]. But the same close correspondence between the poetry of nature and the old myths is to be found in both poets, the idea of the *hero* being the logic result of their enthusiastic feeling of wonder before the majesty and awful stateliness of Nature; in this mood the conception of ideal figures arises spontaneously, and, as Hölderlin sings,

Wie Flammen aus der Wolke Schooss,
Wie Sonnen aus dem Chaos, wanden
Aus Stürmen sich Heroen los.

⁴ P. 55.—See also, p. 5, the picture of the morning landscape:

The scene in front two sloping mountain sides
Displayed; in shadow one, and one in light.
The loftiest on its summit now sustained
The sun-beams, raying like a mighty wheel
Half seen, which left the front-ward surface dark
In its full breadth of shade; the coming sun
Hidden as yet behind: the other mount,
Slanting opposed, swept with an eastward face,
Catching the golden light.

* Old memories

Slumbrously hung above the purple line
Of distance, to the east, while odorously
Glistened the tear-drops of a new-fallen shower;
And sunset forced its beams through strangling
shadows
Gilding green boughs; . . .

physic passages are not without a grave, alluring charm; even its most ethereal images, dressed in the sumptuous garments of dreams, are instinct with this prominent and predominant sense of reality; thus, in the representation of Orion re-born, ascending among the glittering stars:

Mute they [Eos and Artemis] rose
With tender consciousness; and, hand in hand,
Turning, they saw, *slow rising from the sea,*
The luminous Giant clad in blazing stars,
New-born and trembling from their Maker's breath,—
Divine, refulgent effluence of Love.⁷

Thus his realism as well as his creative, imaginative power, his careful observation of nature as well as his wild fantasy go together to shape a poetic world deeply alive with passion, mystery and beauty; we can see the results of his genial effort and his highest attainments in such an inspired passage as the following:

Bright comes the Dawn, and Eos hides her face,
Glowing with tears divine, within the bosom
Of great Poseidon, in his rocking car
Standing erect to gaze upon his son,
Installed midst golden fires, which ever melt
In Eos' breath and beauty; rising still
With nightly brilliance, merging in the dawn,—
And circling onward in eternal youth.

FEDERICO OLIVERO.

Torino.

THE LOSS OF UNACCENTED *e* IN THE 'TRANSITION PERIOD'

It is a generally accepted philological law that in the Middle High German period (1100-1250), Old High German words having short stem syllables followed by *l* or *r* lost the unaccented *e* of the following syllable, e. g., *werelt* > *werlt*; *dere* > *der*; *feret* > *fert*. Under the same conditions unaccented *e* was usually lost after *m* and *n*, but these combinations are treated differently by the different writers. In the early Old High German period (750-850)

⁷ Book III, Canto III, p. 153.

scarcely a trace of this loss of *e* is to be found. A vowel is frequently dropped by Otfried (ca. 870) when it comes before a vowel of a following word (elision), but seldom does he drop a vowel before a consonant of a following word (apocope) or before a consonant of the same word (syncope). But in the language of the transition period from Old High German to Middle High German many examples of apocope and syncope are to be found.

The cause of the loss of *e* after liquids and nasals has not been sufficiently explained. It was doubtless connected with the process of the lengthening of short vowels in open syllables. Michels, *Mittelhochdeutsches Elementarbuch*, p. 52, assumes a more intensive pronunciation of the consonants and a consequent weakening and loss of the vowels. The loss was doubtless due to the word- and sentence-accent and to the fact that the semi-vocalic liquids and nasals can stand at the end of a word without changing their nature as consonants. In Williram's *Übersetzung und Auslegung des Hohenliedes* (Breslauer Hs. hrsg. von H. Hoffmann, Breslau, 1827), the forms *an* and *ána*, *der* and *déro*, etc., are found. As a rule, the longer form is provided with the accent-mark, while the shorter remains unaccented. There are exceptions to this especially in the latter part of the text. Otfried uses the form *thar* in an unaccented position (I, 4, 80; II, 6, 1), and *thára* when accented (I, 1, 71). Braune in the Glossary of his *Lesebuch* makes a rather doubtful distinction in meaning between the two forms, *thar*=*da*, *thára*=*dahin*. It seems quite evident that the accent played a very important part in the loss of the unaccented vowel.

The extent of the working of this sound-law in the early language is not known. Nor is it definitely known when it first made its appearance to any considerable extent in the different dialects. No investigation to determine this has ever been made. Philologists have made statements without adducing the necessary evidence in support. Paul, *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, § 60, Anm., has the following upon the loss of the vowel: "Die meisten

dieser ausstossungen sind erst nach der mitte des 12. jahrh. eingetreten." Behaghel, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, § 200, 4, says: "Die frühesten Beispiele der *e*-Ausstossungen gehören dem 12. Jh. an, vgl. MSD. II. 271," notwithstanding the fact that Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, § 66, Anm. 2, has the following upon the subject: "Während im älteren ahd. synkope alter mittelvocale sich nur in den eben besprochenen fällen zeigt, wird im späthd. bei N die synkope häufig nach den consonanten *r* und *l* (vgl. *Beitr.* 5, 98). Besonders nach kurzer stammsilbe, z. b. *gemálnemo, verlórnez, ervárnêr*." Wilmanns, *Deutsche Grammatik*, § 271, says: "Etwas weiter geht schon Notker. . . . Aber die eigentliche Periode der Apokope und Synkope beginnt später; erst wurden die Unterschiede zwischen den unbetonten Vocalen aufgehoben, dann kam die Zeit, wo sie ganz unterdrückt wurden."

In the first 100 pages of Notker's *Boethius* (Piper, vol. I, Freiburg, 1882-83) the following words are found which show a loss of the unaccented vowel:

5, 7 werlte; 5, 15 unz; 6, 11 an; 7, 16 anderro; 9, 20 unsermo; 10, 16 bilde; 10, 20 wirt; 12, 24 verlornisseda; 14, 17 widerfert; 14, 17 andermo; 14, 31 westert; 16, 26 echert; 18, 1 seldon; 21, 9 herzog; 24, 7 bildotost; 24, 12 gemalnemo; 29, 27 erwarner; 31, 19 welero; 32, 16 birn; 36, 9 solchero; 37, 25 verlornon; 73, 25 gechorner; 78, 14 kebornes; 81, 12 unserro; 90, 17 iwerro; 94, 16 iwerro; 95, 2 birnt; 97, 6 ostert.

The following words occur in the first 75 pages of the Bavarian version of Notker's *Psalms* (Piper, vol. III):

3, 5 an; 4, 2 newirt; 20, 9 florn; 5, 2 fursten; 5, 31 fewarnez; 6, 2 geborn; 9, 5 scult; 9, 31 pildi; 11, 4 werlt; 17, 19 birt; 32, 1 zewelften; 67, 20 unz; 74, 13 ferholno.

It is seen from the above lists that even at the beginning of the eleventh century the unaccented vowel had disappeared to a considerable extent in the Alemannian and the Bavarian dialects. Not only in these dialects but also in the East Franconian of Williram, a

large number of the unaccented vowels are lost. Following is a list of the shortened forms found in Williram's *Hohelied* from the text of H. Hoffmann. Only ms. B has been considered in the selection of the words. Hoffmann's text is a diplomatic reprint of the original ms., which dates from the middle of the eleventh century.

APOCOPE

aller 22;¹ an 48; antwort 1; deheiner 1; der 26; diner 5; einer 1; eteswanne 1; eteswa 1; von 27; vor 3; vor (adv.) 2; glich 17; gnadon 8; gnada 11; gnote 1; gnuoge 1; guoter 3; gwan 3; ir 1; maniger 2; manlicher 1; micheler 1; minir 9; siner 9; swanne 4; swas 3; sweder 1; swer 3; swie 8; unser 2; wil 9.

SYNCOPE

andero 2; andremo 1; bildoton 1; birt 2; dirro 9; vurston 2; garota 1; nals 1; unsermo 1; werlte 23; werltlich 9; wirt 3.

ELISION

aller 13; als 19; an 11; cuss 1; der 7; diner 1; von 10; vor 1; vur 2; gantfristet 1; hab 1; ir 2; lang 1; mocht 3; nals 1; nist 2; nobe 3; riht 1; roter 1; scunt 1; tet 1; unser 1; unt 7; unz 1; want 9; war 1; wil 19; wolt 1; zerist 4; zaller 3; zeiner 1.

A summary of the above shows a total of 420 forms which have lost an unaccented vowel. Of these forms there are 235 cases of apocope, 55 of syncope and 130 of elision. Those of elision are in themselves not of especial importance since they are also found in the earliest Germanic monuments. They do, however, serve to show the proportion between elision on the one hand and apocope and syncope on the other. A further consideration of the word-lists shows that 15 endings of adjectives have been syncopated, or 27.3% of the total number of syncopated forms; 2 stems of verbs, or 3.6%; 23 stems of nouns, or 41.8%; 10 stems of adjectives, or 18.2%; 5 endings of verbs, or 9%. There are 84 apoco-

¹The numeral after the word is the number of times the form occurs in the text.

pated endings of nouns and adjectives, or 35.8%; 78 apocoped endings of prepositions, or 33.2%; 64 endings of adverbial prefixes, or 27.2%; and 9 endings of verbs, or 3.8%. Further, in the first 10 pages of the text there are 302 words retaining an unaccented vowel. These include all the words in which later an unaccented *e* might be expected to disappear. To be compared with these are 50 shortened forms, or 14.2%. From page 34 to 43 there are found 300 long forms, to be compared with 41 shortened, or 12%; and in the last 10 pages, 266 long and 58 shortened, or 17.9%. The average of the three passages is 14.7%.

From the above word-lists and percentages it can be seen that, contrary to the statements of Paul and Behaghel, apocope and syncope appear in the language to a considerable extent at the beginning of the eleventh century and that by the middle of the century, even before the weakening of the vowels to short *e* was general, apocope and syncope were quite common. Especially is this true of the inflectional endings of nouns and adjectives.

A. L. MCCOBB.

Clark College.

AN INSTANCE OF THE FIFTEEN SIGNS OF JUDGMENT IN SHAKESPEARE

Mr. A. W. Verity, in his edition of *Hamlet*, has again called attention to Hunter's suggestion that the portents in *Julius Caesar*, II, ii, 17-24, and *Hamlet*, I, i, 115-20, were derived from a passage in Lucan's *Pharsalia* (I, 526-85), of which the first book was translated by Christopher Marlowe and published in 1600 and 1601. Yet the passage referred to by Hunter, even when supplemented with omens from Plutarch's account of Caesar's death, does not furnish satisfactory parallels for several important details in Shakespeare's list of portents,—namely, those of men groaning in mor-

tal anguish, of yawning graves,¹ of warriors in the clouds, and of dews or rains of blood.

Holinshed, on the other hand, records as many of the Shakespearean portents as Lucan does. For besides the frequent mention of wonders in sun, moon, and stars, the *Chronicles*² contain repeated descriptions of bloody dews (5:134, 162, 480) and of warriors in the clouds (2:35; 3:535; 5:117, 205)—both of which, as has been noted above, are omitted by Lucan. They tell also of mysterious resoundings of arms (3:535; 3:178, 205) and of an inexplicable outcry and sudden death of cattle in the fields (5:212), which resemble pretty closely the portents in *Julius Caesar*, II, ii, 22-23. But the writer of this note does not find in the *Chronicles* anything which corresponds to Shakespeare's yawning graves, whelping lion, groaning, dying men, or wandering, wailing ghosts.

Now the character of these omissions in both instances and the dramatist's specific mention of Doomsday suggest that possibly some writing in doomsday literature may contain all the portents employed here by Shakespeare. In that case the similar phenomena in Holinshed are doubtless to be ascribed to the same source. The analysis which follows is intended to show that the Anglo-Norman version of the *Fifteen Signs of Judgment*,³ beginning

Oiez, seignor, comunement
Dunt Nostre-Seignor nus reprent,

which the author of *Cursor Mundi* has translated into Middle English (ll. 22461-710), unlike any source previously suggested, affords a

¹ Although Hunter says that a portent of yawning graves occurs in the passage cited from Lucan, it is difficult to determine exactly to what he refers. Nothing more significant is to be found there than common-place earthquake phenomena and the misty appearing out of the ground of the shades of Marius and Sulla. It should be noticed also that the signs in Lucan portend Caesar's entrance upon the dictatorship and not, as Hunter states, Caesar's death.

² Citations are to Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, London, 1807 and 1808.

³ Text to be found printed with Victor Luzarche's *Adam*, Tours, 1854.

single origin for all, or certainly all but one, of Shakespeare's portents and, conversely, that the Shakespearean passages show traces of ten of the fifteen signs.

This twelfth century poem Nölle⁴ has selected as typical of the last of the five classes into which he divides the many versions of the Fifteen Signs—a tradition which in various forms had, as Nölle shows, a long-continued and widespread currency, developing and holding vogue contemporaneously with the old theology. That this tradition was partially incorporated by Holinshed in the *Chronicles* is corroborative evidence of its survival in Shakespeare's day. Though Shakespeare may have been unacquainted with this particular poem, he must have come in contact with some version of the *Fifteen Signs* belonging to the class of which this poem is the type.

The bloody rain in *Sign 1* of the French poem,

Del ciel cherra pluie sanglante,
Ne quidez pas que jo vos mente;
Tote terre en iert colorée,
Mult avra ci aspre rosée. (ll. 68-71.)

appears in *Hamlet* I, i, 117, where mention is made of "dews of blood," and in *Julius Caesar* II, ii, 19-21,

Fierce fiery warriors fought upon the clouds,
In ranks and squadrons and right form of war,
Which drizzl'd blood upon the Capitol.

To *Sign 2*, which in part reads

Car del ciel cherront les estoilles:
Ço iert une de ses merveilles.
Nule n'iert tant bien fichie
Qui à cel jor del ciel ne chie
E corront si tost desor terre,
Come foldre, quant ele deserre.
Dessus ces monz irront corant,
Come grant lermes espendant,
E nequedont mot ne dirront. (ll. 84-92.)

the first part of the same line 117 in *Hamlet* corresponds,

As stars with trains of fire.

⁴P. B. B., VI, 413-76.

Similarly the phenomenon described in *Sign 3*,

Que le soleiel que vos veez,
Serra plus nair que nole haire,
Iço ne vos fet pas atraire;
Car le soleil, en droit middi,
Verra le pople tant merci
E que jà gote ne verront
Icil qui à cel jor serront. (ll. 102, 108-113.)

is represented in the next line in *Hamlet* (118) in the phrase,

Disasters in the sun,

and *Sign 4*,

Car la lune, que tant est bele
Al cheif del mois, quant est novele,
Serra mué en vermeil sanc
E en color semblable à fanc.
Mult près de terre descendra,
Mès mult poi i demorera;
Corant vendra droit à la mer. (ll. 128-134.)

has a parallel in the two lines and a half immediately following the remark about the sun,

And the moist star
Upon whose influence Neptune's empire stands
Was sick almost to doomsday with eclipse.
(*Hamlet*, I, i, 118-120.)

Sign 5 tells of the fear which is to seize all beasts,

Car trestotes les mues bestes
Vers le ciel torneront lor testes.
A Deu voldront merci crier,
Mès eles ne porront parler. (ll. 146-149.)

In *Julius Caesar* II, ii, 23, Shakespeare has represented limited disturbances in the brute creation,

Horses did neigh.

To *Signs 6, 7, 8, and 9*, which describe a leveling of the hills, a rising and falling of trees, an upheaval of the sea, and a volubility of the rivers, Shakespeare has nothing to correspond; but *Sign 10* describes the opening of the earth and the issuing forth of the inhabi-

tants of hell, who in a long lament of ten lines cry piteously to be reinstated in their first abode,

Car il verra le ciel partir
E si porra la terre oïr
Braire molt anguissement,
E criera: 'Rois Dex, jo fent'
Lors avront cil d'emfer clarté,
E serront toit esponté.
Toit s'en istrunt fors li diable;
Saint Pol le dist, n'est pas fable.
Or escutez qu'il avront. (ll. 230-238.)

and closely resembles

And ghosts did shriek and squeal about the streets.
(*J. C.*, II, ii, 24.)

And the sheeted dead
Did squeak and gibber in the Roman streets.
(*Hamlet*, I, i, 115-116.)

Sign 11,

Li venz vendront de totes pars,
E sùffleront tant dorement,
L'un contre l'autre fierement,
Que de la terre depecherunt;
De son siege la giteront;
Les novels morz giteront fors,
Par l'eir emporteront les cors
Tot les ferront ferir ensemble. (ll. 251-258.)

becomes in *Julius Caesar*, II, ii, 18

And graves have yawn'd, and yielded up their dead.

and in *Hamlet*, I, i, 115

The graves stood tenantless.

Sign 12, which gives a description of the woful state of men in the Last Day, when they shall cry to God in their final terrible moments,

Le ciel serra reclos ariere,
Donc n'i avra nuls qui ne quiere
L'un vers l'autre sovent conseil.
Chescuns dirra: 'Mult me mervail
Com nos poïm ici ester
Quant tote rien venra finer.'
E crierunt merci au Roi
Qui tote mesure ad en soi;
Quant li angle poïr avront,
Li peccheor, las! que frunt? (ll. 284-293.)

is duplicated in Shakespeare's terse expression,

And dying men did groan. (*J. C.*, II, ii, 23.)

Sign 13, which describes the battle of stones with its great detonations,

Car totes les pieres qui sunt
E desos terre par tot le mond
E desus terre e desuz
Ede ci qu'a abisme ès fonz,
Commenceront une bataille
(Ne quidez pas que jo vos faille,)
E s'entre-ferront mult forment,
Come foldre quant ele descent.
Mult se ferront à grant proeche. (ll. 302-310.)

yields in Shakespeare

The noise of battle hurtled in the air.
(*J. C.*, II, ii, 22.)

Sign 14, the last sign of which there is a trace in Shakespeare's list of portents, gives us the picture of great armies of clouds—a favorite portent, as we discovered, with Holinshed.

Li XIII iert mult mals
A tot le mond comonals
De nois, de gresliz e d'orez,
De mervaillos tempestez
Lors vendront foldres e esclairs,
Trestot en troublera li eirs
Les mues, qui corent si tost;
D'eles ferront un grant host;
Droit à la mer irront fuiant
E mult fort tempeste demenant. (ll. 314-323.)

This is paralleled in Shakespeare by

Fierce fiery warriors fought upon the clouds,
In ranks and squadrons and right form of war.
(*J. C.*, II, ii, 19-20.)

There is now left without a parallel in the Shakespeare passages, only the item

A lioness hath whelped in the streets.
(*J. C.*, II, ii, 17.)

and there is in the French poem nothing exactly like it. But in *Sign 1*, there follows immediately after the lines which describe the bloody dews, a weird phenomenon that pertains to pregnancy among humans, which is of interest in this connection,

Li enfant qui nez ne serront,
 Dedenz les ventres crieront
 Od clere voiz mult haltement:
 'Merci, Rois-Deu omnipotent!
 Ja, Sire, ne querrom nestre
 Mielz voldrium-nos nient estre,
 Que nasquisum à icel jor
 Que tote rien soeffre dolor.' (ll. 72-79.)

That this part of the tradition may in time have become altered so as to refer to beasts, seems not impossible, since as early as Geoffrey of Monmouth (*Prophecies of Merlin*, Chapter 3) a prophecy that beasts will infest cities is found associated with *Sign 1*.

There are, then, good grounds for attributing the portents in *Hamlet* I, i, 115-20 and *Julius Caesar* II, ii, 17-24 to a mediaeval Christian source instead of to Lucan; for the foregoing list of parallels and Shakespeare's mention of Doomsday, present sufficient evidence that these two passages, regardless of any relationship they may bear to the portents in Holinshed, constitute an instance of the *Fifteen Signs of Judgment* belonging to Nölle's fifth class. Doubtless those who attended the theatre in Shakespeare's day understood these allusions and were duly impressed by them because of the continued popular reverence for the doomsday tradition.

C. H. CONLEY.

Wesleyan University.

THE IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE IN PROVENÇAL

That the imperfect subjunctive was one of the earliest verb-forms to disappear in Vulgar Latin has long been among the most generally accepted doctrines of Romance linguistics. Diez¹ characterized it as "überall erloschen". Foth, however, in his article "Die Verschiebung lateinischer Tempora in den romanischen Sprachen,"² showed that it has been preserved to this day in the Logudorian dialect of Sardinia, in forms like *kantare*, *kantere*. Foth's

conclusions were accepted, but the Sardinian forms were looked upon as isolated exceptions. The early disappearance of the imperfect subjunctive continued to be regarded as an indubitable fact. Such is the teaching, for instance, of Meyer-Lübke³ and Grandgent.⁴ Bourciez⁵ is less affirmative. He insists on the gradual character of its disappearance and hints that traces of the form may still be found in the Roumanian conditional *ar cînta*.

Lately a sharp attack on the prevailing doctrine has been made by Gamillscheg in his "Studien zur Vorgeschichte einer romanischen Tempuslehre",⁶ who adduces substantial reasons for believing that the imperfect subjunctive was preserved much longer than is generally supposed. According to him, the form appears in Low Latin texts and documents from all parts of "Romania", though its functions were often usurped by the pluperfect, which became in time the general Romance equivalent. These Low Latin forms may be possibly interpreted as due to classical influence, as the tense of course was never forgotten in the schools. But Gamillscheg⁷ shows that, especially in Italy and the Iberian peninsula, its use is so abundant and so wide-spread and is found in documents of such a "vulgar" character that this explanation is hardly admissible. Furthermore, there are found in many early Italian texts a variety of forms in *-are*, *-ere*, *-iere*, *-ire*, which in usage correspond quite closely to the imperfect subjunctive. Gamillscheg thinks that they are, in fact, survivals of this tense. This view has been disputed,⁸ and it is possible to interpret many of these forms as infinitives; but I do not believe that the syntax permits such an interpretation for all. Gamillscheg likewise proves⁹ that the imperfect subjunctive was constantly used in Low Latin texts of Spain and Portugal, and this enables him to give a new and convincing

¹ *Rom. Gram.*, II, 297.

² *Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, 53.

³ *Éléments de linguistique romane*, 79.

⁴ *Sitzungsberichte der K. A. W.*, Bd. 172, Vienna, 1913.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 204 ff.

⁶ See *ASNS.*, 1913, p. 474.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 263 ff.

¹ *Rom. Gram.*, II, 117.

² *Rom. Studien*, II, 243 ff.

explanation¹⁰ of the so-called inflected infinitive in Portuguese.

It is my purpose in this article to call attention to two examples in Provençal which seem to me to be true imperfect subjunctives, both in form and function. They are found in one of the earliest troubadours, Marcabru, and present a remarkable likeness to the Italian examples cited by Gamillscheg. The first is found at the beginning of song 15 in the latest edition¹¹ of Marcabru and reads as follows:

Cortasamen vuoill comenssar
Un vers si es qui l'escoutar.

The variants are numerous,¹² but all show the form in *-ar*. Dejeanne reads: *si es qui escout' ar*, which seems to me a counsel of desperation. In reality, the adverb *ar*, *er*, is almost invariably placed at the beginning of the clause, before the verb, and I have been unable to find a single example where it is found at the end.¹³ Its essentially unemphatic character would prohibit its being used as the rime-word in a verse. Nor do I see how the syntax permits the form to be explained as an infinitive. On the other hand, this *escoutar* corresponds perfectly in form to a Latin *auscultaret* and in function¹⁴ resembles quite closely the example from Folcacchiero de' Folcacchieri¹⁵ quoted by Gamillscheg:

Dolce madonna, poi ch'eo mi moragio
Non troverai chi si bene a te servire.

The second example is found in Marcabru, 32, 40.

Lo cors m'esglaia,
Ja non o celerai,
Amors veraia
Trobar greu fina sai,
Qu'en lieis non aia
C'a falsadat retrai.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 278.

¹¹ *Poésies complètes du troubadour Marcabru*, p. p. J. M. L. Dejeanne, Toulouse, 1909.

¹² Mss. C.: *sil es qui escotar*; G.: *si es qui cotar*; R.: *si es q' les cotar*.

¹³ The longer forms, *ara*, *era*, do occasionally stand at the end of the clause, at least in prose; see Appel, *Chrestomathie*, p. 192, 23.

¹⁴ Potential in a relative clause of characteristic.

¹⁵ Monaci, *Crestomazia*, No. 40, 38.

In my opinion C has the correct reading¹⁶ in the third line (*qu'amor veraia*), and I would correct Dejeanne's translation thus: "J'ai le coeur plein d'effroi et je ne le cacherai pas, car je trouverais difficilement un amour vrai et fin, sans qu'il y ait en lui (en cet amour) quelque chose se rapportant à fausseté." Adopting this interpretation, we have here an example of the imperfect subjunctive (<Lat. **troparem* or *turbarem*) in a conditional function, almost exactly similar to its use in classical Latin. I do not see how it is possible to consider this form *trobar* an infinitive, and the interpretations proposed by Dejeanne (*trobar*) and Jeanroy (*trob ar*) are faulty in that they put one of the main accents of the line on the word *ar*, which is usually an unemphatic proclitic.

Such isolated survivals in early texts are by no means unexampled. The rare instances of the form derived from the Latin pluperfect indicative in the oldest French texts present a close parallel. It is quite possible that a more careful scrutiny of the mss. of the earlier troubadours would reveal other examples of this form, which have been overlooked or changed by scribes or modern editors. As the variants in the Marcabru mss. show, it must have perplexed the copyists considerably.

WILLIAM PIERCE SHEPARD.

Hamilton College.

INTRUSIVE NASALS IN ENGLISH

A few years ago the present writer directed attention to some instances of intrusive nasals in contemporary speech, American and English, and suggested that in the greater part of these instances associative interference was responsible for the added consonants.¹ The bearing of the material presented on the much discussed topic of Middle English added *n*, for

¹ Variants: C. *Quamor ueraya Trobar greu fina essai*; R. *Trobar greu fina say*; I. *Troba argreu f. a*.

¹ *Englische Studien*, XLV (1912).

which many varying explanations have been offered,² was also treated. Some further instances, heterogeneous in character, of infixed *n*, noted since the article cited was printed but reinforcing, it is believed, the position taken there, are these:

Anthens, Athens. "The city of Anthens."

Used persistently by a pupil in a secondary school. The inserted *n* might have been carried over from the second syllable; but, in this pupil's usage, there seemed to be confusion of the name with the word *anthem*.

ballant, ballad, a Scotch form. "A beuk of old ballants as yellow as the cowslips." J. Wilson, *Noctes Ambrosianae* (1825), Works, I, 2. Cited in *N. E. D.* See also the ballad *Geordie's Wife* (Child, 209, Text C).

'Gar print me ballants weel,' she said,
'Gar print me ballants many,
Gar print me ballants weel,' she said,
'That I am a worthy ladie.'

The intrusive *n* in *ballant* probably arises from association with the common *-ant*, *-ent* suffixes of nouns and adjectives, as in *talent*, *element*, *gallant*, *pedant*, *peasant*, *current*.

cementary, cemetery. "I made a trip to the cementary." Same usage as *Athens*. The added consonant is due to *momentary*, *commentary*, *sedentary*, etc.

comontie, comedy. "Is not a comontie a Christmas gambold?" Sly's word in Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, Ind. ii, 140. A mongrel form arising from the fusing with *comedy* of *common*.

daintive, dative. "The daintive case." Used by a pupil in a secondary school; not a nonce-formation, but spoken under the impression that it was the proper form.

² See especially O. Jespersen *Englische Studien*, XXXI (1902), also *Modern English Grammar*, I (1910); H. Logeman, *Englische Studien*, XXXIV (1904); Otto Ritter, *Archiv*, CXIII (1904); Karl Luick, *ibid.*, CXIV (1905).

The speaker was influenced by the words *dainty*, *plaintive*, etc.

denont, denote. "The place 'from which' is denonted in Latin by the ablative." Same usage as *daintive*.

incindent, incident. "That was an interesting incindent." Same usage as *daintive*. This form has the added *n* of unaccented middle syllables earliest to receive attention.

marcantant, merchant. "A marcantant or a pedant." Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, IV, ii, 63. From Italian *mercantante* and *merchant* (*marchant*).

rumfle, to ruffle, rumple. See Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*. A crossing of *ruffle* and *rumple*.

sumple, supple, pliant. "Her skin is as sumple as a Duchess's." Hardy, *Tess* (1891). Wright. From *supple* influenced by *limber* or *pliant*.

trinkling, trickling. Form used invariably in a version repeated in Nebraska of the Old-World ballad "Lord Lovel." Obviously a crossing of *trickling* and *twinkling*.

He ordered her grave to be opened wide,
Her shroud to be folded down,
And there he kissed her pale cold cheeks
Till the tears came trinkling down.

Trinkling has been heard also in children's usage in the phrase "trinkling tears."

Among nonce-formations showing intrusive *n* were noted *dinky* for *dickey*, said under the influence of the slang epithet "dinky" used just before, *shenkel* for *shekel*, and *coumplet* spoken for *couplet*.

To Professor Jespersen's instances of names with unstable medial *n*, as *Robinson*, *Robison*, *Edmundstone*, *Edmiston*, *Hutchinson*, *Hutchison*, and the like,³ giving rise, he suggests, to analogous unstable medial *n* (afterward becoming permanent) in *nightingale*, *messenger*, etc., may be added the name *Higginson*, or *Higgeson*, of the American colonist:

"At this meeting information was given by Mr. Nowell by letters ffrom Izake Johnson,

³ *Modern English Grammar*, I, p. 35.

that one Mr. Higgeson of Lester, an able minister" . . . "and if Mr. Higgeson may conveniently be had to goe this present voiage."⁴

"Mr. Francis Higgeson & Mr. Samuel Ske-ton intended ministers of the plantation", etc.⁵

The word *flounder* has been explained as a nasalized form of the Dutch *flodderen*, through the influence of *flounce*, or of *flounder*, the fish.⁶ *Galantine*, from French *galatine*, a special sauce for fish, has an added *n*, through association with *gallant*; but the added *n* is brought from French, which has the nasalized form alongside the unnasalized. Blending is probably responsible also for the *n*'s in the two words of doubtful etymology, *chump* and *jumper*, the garment. The former, *i. e.*, a man as unintelligent as a block or chump (*i. e.*, short thick lump) of wood is perhaps an amalgamation of *chop* and *lump*.⁷ A derivation from *chub* has also been suggested,⁸ in which case the term would still be a blend, gaining its *n* from *lump*, *bump*, etc. If *chump* is a by-form of *chunk*, the nasal is accounted for without the assumption of intrusion. Probably, however, none of these derivations is sufficient in itself, but the word is rather to be classed as an "echoic composite" or "indefinite blend."⁹ A plausible etymology for *jumper*, from the obsolete *jump*, blouse, short coat, connects it with the French *juppe*, associated with *jump*, the verb and substantive, *i. e.*, the garment is one which may be "jumped on" in a hurry.¹⁰ Compare a "slip." If this be the case, blending is again responsible for the added nasal.

⁴ *Records of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay*, I, 37, 38. Cited in T. W. Higginson's *Life of Francis Higginson*, N. Y., 1891, p. 32.

⁵ From Young's *Chronicle of Massachusetts*, p. 316. Cited in T. W. Higginson's *Life*, p. 36.

⁶ *The Century Dictionary*.

⁷ *The New English Dictionary*.

⁸ *The Century Dictionary*.

⁹ See "Indefinite Composites and Word-Coinage," *The Modern Language Review*, July, 1913.

¹⁰ *The New English Dictionary*, also *The Century Dictionary*.

The etymology of most of the words cited in the last paragraph is too uncertain for much weight to be given to their testimony.

LOUISE POUND.

University of Nebraska.

RECENT WORKS ON THE THEORY OF THE NOVELLE

Die Rolle des Erzählers in der Epik, von Dr. KÄTE FRIEDEMANN. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte hrsg. von O. F. Walzel, 7. Heft.) Leipzig, 1910. 246 pp.

Die Entwicklung der novellistischen Kompositionstechnik Kleists bis zur Meisterschaft. (Der Findling, Die Verlobung in San Domingo, Das Erdbeben in Chili. Die Marquise von O. . . . Unter Ausschluss des Kohlhaas-Fragmentes), von KURT GÜNTHER. Leipzig Dissertation, 1911. 88 pp.

Die novellistische Kunst Heinrichs von Kleist, von HERMANN DAVIDTS. (Bonner Forschungen, Neue Folge V.) Berlin, 1913. 151 pp.

These three works, appearing within the last four years, represent a new departure in the critical study of narrative art in general and of the *Novellen* of Kleist in particular. They agree in marking a reaction from the Spielhagen definition of the *Novelle*. While Friedemann lays down the general laws underlying this departure, Günther and Davidts apply these laws to the investigation of Kleist's technique and throw new light upon his development as a writer of prose fiction. They upset some long-cherished theories concerning both the date of composition of some of the *Novellen* and their relative importance in the development of the artist Kleist.

Much has been written since the days of Spielhagen upon the points of resemblance be-

tween the drama and the *Novelle*, and attempts have been made—especially by naturalists like Holz and Schlaf—to produce *Novellen* that should be almost nothing but dialogue. Friedemann proceeds from the opposite point of departure and furnishes us with valuable points of distinction between the two phases of literature. To her the essence of all epic writing, including the *Novelle*, lies in the open and undisguised narration of a series of events by a third person—the author himself, or some one to whom he delegates the task. Through the eyes of this third person we see and judge the characters. The essence of the dramatic form of literature lies in the illusion which the drama creates that we are ourselves present at the action and get our information concerning the characters only from themselves. The novel and *Novelle*, then, represent Kant's world, in which not "das Ding an sich" is experienced, but only its reflex in the mind of the one who tells the tale. Spielhagen's insistence on the elimination of the narrator, which, according to Friedemann, resulted in a lamentable impoverishment of the *Novelle*, she explains as a natural reaction against the exaggerated verbosity of his time. The tendency to make of the prose tale a repository for the author's sentiments or views on all sorts of questions entirely extraneous to his plot (a tendency which, she might have added, goes back to no less a person than Tieck and his powerful influence) is responsible for this almost superstitious fear of the innocent narrator. She aptly calls it a "Kampf gegen die Willkür im Namen des Gesetzes" (p. 28). It led Spielhagen to confuse "dramatic illusion" with "intellectual objectivity." This latter is not a matter of form so much as an attitude of mind on the author's part. Schiller, who certainly preserved dramatic illusion, was accused by Grillparzer of making *Maria Stuart* only his mouthpiece (p. 4). We might add that good narrators from Homer to Schnitzler have combined a high degree of objectivity with the frankest narration of the story by the author.

Upon the principle of epic art outlined above, the author bases her theory of the epic "Blickpunkt," the matrix of her entire study. This

is the telling designation which she gives to the method in which the reader is made to participate in the events related in the tale. In the drama, the "Blickpunkt" may be in one or more of the characters; the author disappears altogether, and the reader views events always through the eyes of the participants; in the narrative, however, the narrator frankly takes the reader with him, and all that happens is witnessed by the reader through the medium of this person, to whom all these events are past history, and who can at will lead the reader forward or backward, tell him secrets which the characters of the fiction do not know, and place him at any point of vantage he chooses. In the so-called dramatic *Novellen*, the "Blickpunkt" is often placed, for a time at least, in the characters themselves, but sooner or later it must needs shift to the narrator. (We shall see later, that, according to Davidts, Kleist passes in his *Novellen* from the employment of the dramatic to the epic "Blickpunkt.") Davidts uses this fact as one of the criteria by which he distinguishes the earlier from the later *Novellen*.) From this fundamental law of epic "Blickpunkt," the author derives as necessary corollaries the various details of technique, i. e., direct and indirect characterization, setting of the scene, use of direct and indirect speech, use of metaphors and similes, etc.

Friedemann maintains that the attempt to make the narrative "dramatic" by insisting on the dramatic "Blickpunkt" and the almost complete elimination of the narrator as in Holz and Schlaf's *Neue Gleise* and other tales of the naturalistic school deprives the narrator of many natural advantages and tends greatly to impoverish the *Novelle* (p. 126). This is well illustrated by a comparison of Zola's *Thérèse Raquin* in its original narrative form, with the later dramatization of the story. In the novel, habitual actions which, while not dramatically important, were characteristically significant and illuminating, were frequently briefly summarized. This advantage the dramatization lost, since the drama has no recourse except to have such actions repeated on the stage, which would give them undue emphasis in the economy of the plot. From this fact the author

deduces with acumen: "Vielleicht ist hier der tiefste Grund dafür zu suchen, dass im allgemeinen das Drama mehr Handlung, der Roman mehr Zuständliches bietet" (p. 127).

The epic "Blickpunkt" must needs exercise a controlling influence over all details of technique. Thus, by the frequent use of indirect speech, an author is enabled to summarize briefly what is less important, throwing the important communications into high relief by employing direct quotation. By direct characterization the narrator can put his readers immediately in possession of the essential facts concerning the characters, and from the point of vantage of one who knows the outcome as well as the genesis can throw light on significant passages which might otherwise escape the reader. From the same point of vantage also, the narrator can take liberties with time, beginning (like Otto Ludwig in *Zwischen Himmel und Erde*) with the end, only afterwards taking the reader back to the beginning of the story (p. 109).

There is perhaps a tendency on the part of Friedemann to overrate the advantages of the epic technique over the dramatic. Though the dramatist is more bound to representation of the action in chronological order and lacks the epic writer's opportunities of referring easily and naturally to the future and the past, yet we have but to consider Ibsen's analytical dramas (I need but mention *Rosmersholm* as one out of several) to become aware, that the consummate dramatic artist has ways and means at his command of drawing the past and the future into the action of the present, not as dead narratives, nor as a "prologue cut off from the play itself" (p. 108), but as living forces and most telling influences. A more detailed comparison here between the dramatic and the epic method of producing these results would have been desirable. This criticism, however, seems cavil when applied to a work that adds so much to our insight of narrative technique. The chapters under "Der Blickpunkt des Erzählers" and "Die Komposition" are especially clarifying and will form the basis for entirely new criticisms of individual writers

of fiction, as they have already done for the evaluation of Kleist.

Quite in accord with the principles laid down by Friedemann, both Günther and Davidts trace in Kleist's *Novellen* a steady progress from the dramatic to the purely epic technique. Davidts, especially, demonstrates that the so-called later *Novellen* are by no means proof of decaying powers, but show rather a gradually strengthening grasp upon the fundamental principles of epic form and a daring advance into original paths of composition, so that we have every reason to believe that Kleist was on the way to become the creator of the modern German novel, as well as of the modern German drama.

This theory led Günther and Davidts to consider the *Novellen* from a new point of view: as exponents, complementary to the dramas, of Kleist's development as an artist. Basing upon salient points of content and of form, they both essay a redating of the *Novellen*, which yields original results. Though differing in some important details, they agree in the daring innovation of placing the three *Novellen*: *Verlobung*, *Erdbeben*, and *Findling* very much earlier in Kleist's productive period than had ever before been done. Günther, in an earlier study (*Euphorion* VIII, *Ergänzungsheft*), had tried to prove that, so far from being a product of Kleist's last and decadent years, *Findling* was by content, mood, and many details of form, closely related to the earliest period of productivity—to the *Schroffenstein*-period. *Verlobung* and *Erdbeben* he places very soon after, and forms of them, together with the "Kohlhaas-Fragment," a group that he calls "Werke der realistisch-tragischen Periode," and which occupies the period between 1801 and 1807 (p. 14). Davidts agrees with Günther in the dating of the group as a whole, but he places *Erdbeben* and *Verlobung* before *Findling* and relates the latter rather with the *Guiskard* than with the *Schroffenstein* mood. Both agree that *Findling* is a novel *in nuce*, "ein Romanvorfurf auf achtzehn Seiten gezwängt" (Günther, p. 35) rather than a dramatic *Novelle*, like the other two. Davidts shows through a large number of instances that, as regards inner form, *Erdbeben* and *Verlobung* are more

closely related to the *Schroffenstein*-period, the very names of the characters of *Erdbeben* being almost in every instance identical with those of *Schroffenstein* (Davidts, p. 23). The prevailing idea of human puppets in the hand of an inexorable fate, which animates especially *Erdbeben*, but also *Verlobung*, is identical with the mood of *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, and Davidts adduces many points of relation, especially the mood of almost morbid depression and pessimism in *Findling*, with the period of Kleist's despair over the failure of *Guiskard* (Davidts, p. 49). Furthermore, Davidts points out that while *Erdbeben* and *Verlobung* evidently arose from the visualization of a single dramatic scene, the *Findling* is a study of character. In this respect it is to be classed with *Penthesilea* and *Kohlhaas* (pp. 45 and 10). The loose construction of *Findling*, the evident groping for an untried method of expression, which causes Günther to place the *Findling* first in Kleist's *Novellen*, Davidts explains in part by the belief that Kleist evidently gave this early attempt only the most casual revision before its publication in 1811, in part by the belief that here Kleist for the first time tried a purely epic style, the previous *Novellen* having been, both in respect to "Blickpunkt" and all the details of style, almost completely dramatic. "Mit dem *Findling* beginnt die Reihe der epischen Novellen" (p. 91).

Both Günther and Davidts see in these three *Novellen* Kleist's period of preparation and experiment in epic technique, of which the artistic fruition is to be found in *Kohlhaas*. They accept Meyer-Benfey's analysis of the triple division of the *Kohlhaas* material (*Euphorion* XV). Günther does not carry his study further, as he considers this the culmination of Kleist's development into a master of narrative. Davidts makes a minute study of all the *Novellen* and obtains some very interesting results. The evidence of the architectural arrangement of material in all the tales, which seems to point to a much more conscious art than is usually attributed to Kleist, the careful analysis of Kleist's method of placing the "Blickpunkt,"

almost completely dramatic in *Erdbeben* and *Verlobung*, epic for the first time in *Findling* (p. 128); these are valuable results and throw much light on Kleist's method and on his development.

A most original bit of criticism is that of *Die Marquise von O*. Davidts here quotes at length an article published by Günther in the *Vossische Zeitung* (Sonntagsbeilage) for November 19, 1911. This *Novelle* was there dissected as a comedy of situation, with a serious background of almost tragic character-struggle on the part of the heroine—a Shakespearean mixture of the tragic and the farcical. Davidts, who agrees on the whole with Günther's opinion, sees in the mood of the story a new element in Kleist's attitude towards society: "Er söhnt sich aus mit der gebrechlichen Einrichtung der Welt, und lernt weltbürgerlich denken" (p. 69).

Equally new and suggestive is Davidts's interpretation of *Bettelweib* and *Cäcilie*. Both tales bear the same burden: madness induced by mysterious sound. The author sees in them "Produkte des kleistischen Lebensringens, seines dichterischen Ideals, Dichtkunst und Musik durch Wort- und Tonkunst zu vereinen." He calls them "wortmusikalische Kompositionen," renewed attempts at reaching the *Guiskard* ideal (pp. 85 ff.). He compares the compositions to Bach fugues and carries out the parallel in minute and convincing fashion. Thus the very *Novellen* which have usually been considered indubitable signs of the poet's decaying powers are made to appear as the promising first-fruits of a newly discovered section of the *terra incognita* of narrative art.

All three works here discussed undoubtedly lead us to higher levels in criticism and open vistas which will modify all future views of Kleist's *Novellen*. Günther and Davidts also augment the poignancy of our regret that so much promise on Kleist's part should have been left unfulfilled.

HENRIETTA BECKER VON KLENZE.

Providence, R. I.

Les Comédies-Ballets de Molière par MAURICE PELLISSON. Paris, Hachette, 1914. x + 234 pp.

The lover of Molière ordinarily regards the *comédies-ballets* with an unmixed sentiment. It is one of resentment that the man of genius, overworked in his theater and harried in his home, should have been obliged to waste his time in writing them and in producing them. In the best of these spectacles he can see only the material for pure comedy tricked out with song and dance to meet the exacting taste of the king.

It is precisely this attitude on the part of the lover of Molière that Mr. Pellisson sets himself to correct in his book, and the result is a thesis rather than a dissertation. The chief defect is one inseparable perhaps from books dealing with the minor works of an author: a loss of perspective and the disappearance of the greater behind the less, so that the reader is apt to close the book with a bewildered sense that the real Molière is to be sought in the author of *La Princesse d'Elide* and *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*. And he carries away this feeling in spite of the numerous protests of the author.

Mr. Pellisson in the beginning states certain prejudices current against the *comédies-ballets*. These prejudices are chiefly: first, that the pieces are in themselves negligible, being hastily scrambled together at royal command; and second, that they took time and energy which Molière would rather, and should rather, have devoted to greater works. These prejudices he sets out to overcome, and let it be said at once that he succeeds in the first instance, but not altogether in the second.

A certain obliquity of reasoning, as well as a confusion of impression, results from the author's neglecting to divide the *comédies-ballets* into classes, and from his habit of drawing on one or the other of them for illustration as the point in question demands. Now there are thirteen of the pieces considered, and they range all the way from *Georges Dandin*, which belongs in the category only by virtue of its

having been inserted in a spectacle, and *Les Fâcheux*, which was written first as a comedy and then furnished with ballets, to *Les Amants magnifiques* and *La Princesse d'Elide* and *Mélicerte*, which have no possible excuse for being except as the frame for court pageants. Between these extremes we have *Le Malade imaginaire* and *La Comtesse d'Escarbagnas*, which may stand alone as finished comedies without the need of any ballet, the *Pastorale comique*, virtually the libretto of a comic opera, *Le Mariage forcé*, which was a ballet at the court but a farce in the city, *L'Amour médecin* and *Le Sicilien*, which are true *opéras comiques*, and *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme* and *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, true types of the *comédie-ballet*, but rising far above the genre by virtue of their brilliant characterization. If the author had made some such division, it would have been to the advantage not only of a clearer exposition, but of his own thesis as well. The most reverential worshipper of Molière is willing to grant favors to Monsieur Jourdain that he will not extend to Mélicerte.

Mr. Pellisson is so preoccupied with the two points that he is aiming to establish—that the *comédies-ballets* are in themselves valuable and that they do not exist to the prejudice of greater works—that it is impossible in a review of his book to separate the thesis from the data he brings forward. And this is a pity, for the data in themselves are comprehensive, many of them new or viewed from an original angle, and they are marshalled in orderly arrangement except for the confusion above mentioned.

In his first chapter he reviews briefly the prejudices existing against this genre; in the second he sets himself to prove that Molière liked it and did not judge it inferior. It is in this chapter that he endeavors to prove the most, and here that he stretches argument to the breaking point. He quotes for the opposition the famous passage from *L'Impromptu de Versailles* (scene 3) in which Molière gave from the stage with his own mouth his theory of comedy. This is his *poetica*, and sketches the material for five or six comedies of character and of custom drawn from the court alone. Mr. Pellisson responds that in this

passage Molière says nothing to warrant our believing that this form of the comic art was the only one legitimate in his eyes (p. 14). Perhaps not; but it does show that at the end of the year 1663 his mind was running over with material for comedies of character and of custom, and that he was laying out for himself a program that allowed no leisure for court spectacles. And in January of 1664 he produced the ballet of *Le Mariage forcé* at the king's command, and four months later *La Princesse d'Elide* for the huge pageant of *Les Plaisirs de l'Ile enchantée*. Much leisure these productions left him for writing comedies of character. Some of the material sketched in *L'Impromptu* appears in *Le Misanthrope* in 1666; but *Le Misanthrope* itself is buried between *L'Amour médecin*, which precedes it, and the farce *Le Médecin malgré lui* with the ballets *Mélicerte*, *Pastorale comique*, and *Le Sicilien*, which immediately follow it. Was this the sort of thing Molière had in mind when he spoke from the stage in his own person in *L'Impromptu*?

Mr. Pellisson's argument on this point amounts to this: Molière does not say he will *not* produce *comédies-ballets*, therefore he took pleasure in producing them. He has some other arguments that may be reduced to some such syllogistic form as this: ballets were popular with the people at this time; Molière loved to please the people; therefore Molière loved to produce ballets (p. 21). He argues further that these pieces gave Molière the opportunity to show the various sides of his talent as an actor, notably his ability as a singer and dancer. He mentions the fact that Molière introduced singing into his own rôles of Mascarille, of Lysandre (*Les Fâcheux*), of Moron (*Princesse d'Elide*), of Sganarelle (*Médecin malgré lui*), of Lycas (*Pastorale comique*), and of Don Pèdre (*Sicilien*) (p. 24). The difficulty with this argument is that *Les Précieuses ridicules* and *Le Médecin malgré lui* are not *comédies-ballets*, and that in all of the rôles the singing is burlesque. Molière did not apparently pique himself on the possession of a superior voice and method; and when he wanted to introduce

singing into a rôle he did not hesitate to do so in farce and comedy as well as in the ballets. A more convincing argument is that by producing these entertainments Molière gained the favor of the king, brought his company into prominence, and got the money that he needed for himself and them. This may readily be granted, but it can hardly be taken as proof of Molière's artistic preference for the genre.

That Molière begrudged the time and labor spent on these ballets, and regretted that he had not the leisure to write great comedies, Mr. Pellisson says can not be proved by any word or allusion of the dramatist (p. 26). Certainly Molière did not refer in so many words to his own "*hautes comédies*"; Mr. Pellisson himself calls attention (p. 29) to his consistent modesty in referring to his own works. But that he was rushed in their production, that the king in his commands displayed a royal indifference to his purveyor's time and strength, we have ample proof. One has only to read Molière's speech in his own person to Madeleine Béjart in *L'Impromptu* (scene 1), his foreword to *L'Amour médecin*, which ballet, he says, was "conceived, written, learned and played in five days"; and that to *Les Fâcheux*, for which a fortnight was allowed; one has only to consider *Mélicerte*, left uncompleted at the second act, and *La Princesse d'Elide*, commenced in verse and finished in prose, to understand how little consideration the king showed Molière. And that is the main point; no matter if these spectacles did not literally supplant some great comedy, they imposed on time already filled to overflowing, and sapped strength already near to the breaking point. We must remember, too, that any consideration of Molière's activity must take account of the fact that he was actor and producer, as well as author. That he should have been obliged to waste himself on these vanities in his triple capacity must seem to us monstrous.

In the chapters on the antecedents of the *comédie-ballet* and Molière's method of constructing them, there is little room for the thesis, and in them Mr. Pellisson gives much

that is new and illuminating. The court ballet before Molière was a conventional affair, with dances, songs, and *récits*, spoken or sung, with so little connection that programs were necessary to tell the spectators what it was about. The *entrées*, or dances, were the main consideration, and the songs and recitations helped to explain them. Molière's originality consists in joining these elements to form a dramatic unity, and that it was a conscious innovation we know from the *avertissement* to *Les Fâcheux*, the first of his *comédies-ballets*:

"Pour ne point rompre le fil de la pièce par ces manières d'intermèdes, on s'avisa de les coudre au sujet du mieux que l'on put, et de ne faire qu'une seule chose du ballet et de la comédie. . . . Quoi qu'il en soit, c'est un mélange qui est nouveau pour nos théâtres."

Les Fâcheux, to be sure, was written as a comedy, and the ballets were inserted afterward; but even so they come on à propos of the action. And as Molière went on he developed the genre, till in *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* and *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme* we have the antecedents of true *opéra comique*, with the singing and dancing so intimately bound up with the text that either part would be incomplete of itself. It is interesting to note that in this present year Wolf-Ferrari, perhaps the most promising of the younger Italian composers, has produced successfully his opera *L'Amore medico*, with the libretto but little changed from Molière's text.

In the chapters on poetry and fancy in the *comédies-ballets* Mr. Pellisson brings forward some of his most original observations. He very justly remarks that in this genre Molière's poetic fancy has freer rein than in his greater comedies, and in it we are treated to an aspect of the poet's genius too often ignored. If this fancy is not that of Shakespeare or of Aristophanes, if *Le Bourgeois gentilhomme* and *Le Malade imaginaire* stand more solidly on the earth than *The Tempest* or *The Clouds*, still they are pure fantasies, no less ample in their scope than these. The charming little saynète of *Le Sicilien* is pure poetry, and even in the pastorals there comes a breath from the forest of Arden.

The author brings out some interesting facts as to the medium in which the *comédies-ballets* are written. Save for the first act and part of the second of *La Princesse d'Elide* they are all printed in prose. But Mr. Pellisson shows that much of this is rhythmical prose, and not a little of it blank verse. This fact did not altogether escape Molière's contemporaries, and Ménage had noticed that *Le Sicilien* was "a little comedy all woven of unrhymed verses of six, five, or four feet." Our present critic goes much further, and finds verses scattered freely through all the *comédies-ballets*, detecting them in many places where they are not, perhaps, to be distinguished by any but a French ear. But the whole field of rhythmical prose is too uncertain for a foreigner to venture upon it, and we can only say that Mr. Pellisson proves that Molière used a different medium for these pieces, a prose that slipped often into verse, and was admirably adapted to the matter in hand.

Possibly the most important and most original points made in the book are in connection with the question of social satire in the comedies. The author calls attention to the fact that after 1666, after *Tartuffe* and *Don Juan* and *Le Misanthrope*, Molière wrote no more social satires. His two remaining great comedies, *L'Avare* and *Les Femmes savantes* belong to the field of moral and literary satire. Why was this? Brunetière¹ offers a literary reason: that Molière felt that he was getting away from true comedy and was tending to *drame*; that he felt that he had come face to face with the impassable barriers of the genre, and turned back to the field of lighter comedy. Mr. Pellisson has a different reason, and a convincing one. He holds that after the attacks delivered by the marquises on account of the *Critique de l'Ecole des femmes*, and the assaults of the church provoked by *Tartuffe* and *Don Juan*, Molière felt that the ground of social comedy was no longer a safe one for him to tread, and abandoned it; and that after 1666 he confined this social satire to the *comédies-ballets*. At first glance this seems like more of Mr. Pel-

¹ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Jan. 1, 1906.

lisson's predilection for the genre, but the facts bear him out; let it be remembered that the great attacks on the doctors are delivered in *L'Amour médecin*, *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, and *Le Malade imaginaire*; that M. Jourdain and the masters that surround him, as well as the parasitic nobles, figure in a *comédie-ballet*; that the philosophers Pancrace and Marphurius appear in *Le Mariage forcé*; and that in *Georges Dandin* one of the most searching questions of any society and any time is propounded. Mr. Pellisson does not claim that Molière did this consciously; but he did it, and the presence of this social satire in these pieces does more than any other one thing to bring them near the level of the greater works.

This book is not one that the student of Molière can afford to neglect. If the author does not succeed in reconciling us to the pastorals, if we must still regret that the greatness of a man was subjected to the littleness of a king, yet for the best of the *comédies-ballets* he performs a service well worth the doing. He analyzes them with a scholarly thoroughness, he brings to bear on the subject many points of internal and external evidence hitherto unknown or ignored, and, finally, raises them to the dignity of a place of their own in the *petit théâtre* of Molière.

WALTER PEIRCE.

Ohio State University.

Les Chants des Grecs et le philhellénisme de Wilhelm Müller par GASTON CAMINADE. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1913. 8vo., 198 pp. (Bibliothèque de Philologie et de Littérature modernes.)

This intelligent, thoroughgoing work of French scholarship shows a fresh and vital interest in German culture, and offers a happy token of the social and friendly influence of humane studies. The author treats the German War of Liberation objectively and sympathetically (Napoleon's rule is termed "une oppres-

sion humiliante et brutale"). The order of presentation is clear, and there is every evidence of wide and deep research. Good use is made of R. F. Arnold's important study, *Der deutsche Philhellenismus* (*Euphronion*, 1896); although the author does not rise to Arnold's distinction of style, he shows himself well able to continue Arnold's investigations in an independent spirit. Like the latter, he views the German enthusiasm for the independence of the Greeks under three heads: the passion for political freedom; religious faith;¹ love of ancient Greek culture.

All of these elements are accounted for, and studied exhaustively from their beginnings. The author is among the first to exploit the materials contained in Müller's singularly intimate diary (Chicago, 1903), but one gains the impression that he is not familiar with the very rare *Bundesblüthen* as a factor in accounting for the doings of Müller's Muse, "cette modeste et paisible fille des champs," after 1821,—a suspicion which is strengthened by the fact that no mention is made in the bibliography of the easily accessible reprint of Müller's contributions in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XIII.

Beginning with a general survey of German enthusiasm for Greek liberation, the work considers in turn the evolution of the *Griechenlieder*, their historical background, literary influences, their literary value, the significance of Müller's translations of Fauriel's Greek *Volkslieder*.²

Müller's poems are justly held to be the most interesting products of the whole movement, because they give the most faithful presentation, in their entirety and in their details, of the vibrant enthusiasm which stirred all

¹In paying tribute to Müller's dream of devoting himself to studying theology, and living "ganz für Gott und sein Wort," Caminade omits mention of Müller's touching preliminary, that he should first draw the grand prize in the lottery.

²It is not generally known that the ms. of Daniel Sanders' important collection of modern Greek folk-songs has been acquired by the library of Northwestern University.

Europe in witnessing the regeneration of Greece.

Caminade agrees with the editor of the critical edition of Müller's poems (Berlin, 1906) in the reconstruction of the third fascicule of the *Neue Lieder der Griechen*, which was suppressed by the Leipzig censorship in 1823. The missing eighth song, which Müller sent Brockhaus on July 17, 1823, is still unaccounted for. It may be mentioned that Mrs. N. C. Terrill of the University of Kansas has elaborated a plausible argument for including the *Hymne auf den Tod Raphael Riegos* in this group, in spite of intrinsic chronological obstacles. The reasoning is based upon the following facts: (1) In an unpublished letter to F. A. Brockhaus, written as early as January 29, 1823, Müller wrote: "Vielleicht singe ich bald *Lieder der Hispanier*. Die Antwort des Kortes an den heiligen Bund ist grossartig und würde sich leicht einer poetischen Behandlung fügen." (2) Müller had a remarkable habit of celebrating the death of his heroes long before the event, as in the case of Canaris (*Konstantin Kanari*), Botzaris (*Bozzari*), and Odysseus (*Odysseus' Tod*), a poem sent to Brockhaus on September 12, 1822, but withdrawn by its author on September 29, on the convincing ground, "da dieser entweder lebt, oder ein Verräther ist." The details of Riego's execution (November 7, 1823) reflected in the poem seem to me, however, to go beyond the powers of any poet, be he never so prophetic.

Another problem lies in Müller's relation to the modern Greek "political verse" of fifteen syllables, which he employed so largely in translating Fauriel (the original French volumes published in 1824 and 1825). Arnold and Caminade count eleven *Griechenlieder* in this form, but there are, strictly speaking, but four, all of them in the suppressed *Drittes Heft*, and all written toward the end of 1822 or in the earlier part of 1823. No satisfactory reason has yet been shown for Müller's sudden adoption of this most characteristic meter before the appearance of Fauriel's collection.

The task of distinguishing between the two

editions of the *Missolunghi*-brochure (p. 33) is reduced to zero if one bears in mind that the Dessau copy is printed in Latin letters, while that of Dresden is in German text.

Caminade's singular accuracy in regard to obscure and scattered German sources is especially praiseworthy. On p. 32, l. 2, for *Kanaris* should be read *Kanari*; for *von der Rechte* (p. 33), *von der Recke*; for *Griechischer Feuer* (p. 142), *Griechisches Feuer*; for *Vester* (p. 113), *Veste*. Before the mention of Max Müller's untrustworthy sketch of his father's life in the *Allg. Deutsche Biographie* some danger-signal should have been displayed. On p. 24 the name of a professor who has worked in this field undergoes a painful mutilation. The poem *Gegen die Pharisäer* (p. 29) appeared later as *Griechisches Feuer*, and not as *Die verpestete Freiheit*; similarly on page 30, after *Griechisches Feuer* should occur, in parenthesis, "déjà paru."

To the biographical sources on p. 194 should be added an article on Müller's *Diary and Correspondence* in the *Deutsche Rundschau* for March, 1902; among "German periodicals" (p. 198) might well be mentioned the *Deutsche Blätter für Poesie, Litteratur, Kunst und Theater*, Breslau, 1823, as being the only source for Müller's dramatic fragment, *Leo, Admiral von Cypern*, a production which has a real bearing upon the matter of the book. There is, unfortunately, no index to this otherwise well-elaborated publication.

I cannot forbear to plead here for a full edition of Müller's letters to F. A. Brockhaus and his son Heinrich, extending from 1819 to the last day of the poet's life. One hundred and twenty-nine in number, they shed an incomparable light upon his entire literary activity, but they remain locked away in the inaccessible archives of the Brockhaus-firm in Leipzig. Surely there can no longer be any good reason for withholding them from publication!

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD.

Northwestern University.

François Villon: sa Vie et son Temps. Par PIERRE CHAMPION. Paris, Champion, 1913. Two vols. viii + 332 pp. with 24 plates, and 450 pp. with 25 plates.

In recent years no fresh external evidence explicitly concerning François Villon has come to light, so that a "life" of Villon, if written without reference to the internal evidence or to the external evidence which without naming Villon is applicable to him, might still be narrated in a page or two. But Villon's 3161 extant verses are so personal, so well packed with autobiography, and contain so many passages which allude to other men and women, or to the physical and moral environment in which he lived, that it is possible to combine the information derived from both sources in a rich narrative the essential truthfulness of which the most skeptical critic need have no frequent reasons to doubt. If Mr. Pierre Champion occasionally ratifies uncertainty with a *sans doute*, we may calmly substitute a ?, lay the peccadillo to a momentary weakness, and continue to follow him with a conviction that, if not ten times out of ten, at least nine, the hundreds of archives which he has examined with his own eyes or has quoted indirectly say what he says they do and warrant the conclusions which he has drawn. If Mr. Champion has not enabled us to see even "the tip of Villon's little finger," he has made him tangible in the psychological sense, and this Villon, more important to us than the most accurate physical presentment, he has caused to move amid his original surroundings, making these as visible as word-pictures allow when they are reinforced by many reproductions of original miniatures, woodcuts of things and persons, maps of Villon's Paris, etc.

"Il faudroit avoir esté de son temps à Paris"—so wrote Villon's first critical editor, Clément Marot, about 1532, and Mr. Champion has taken this saying as a motto to be followed with all possible diligence. "J'ai donc tenté de promener le lecteur à travers ce Paris où Villon a beaucoup erré, en lui nommant au passage les maisons des légataires, les

particularités de la rue et de la vie parisienne que mentionna le poète, ce qu'un écolier de son temps aurait aperçu dans la grand'ville. Ce sera, si l'on veut, un voyage d'imagination, mais tout entier justifié par des documents."

This desire has produced an entertaining book of great value to those who wish to know as intimately as is possible at present how Paris looked about 1450 and to study the life of "la grand'ville"—the manners, thoughts, and acts, and chiefly in these all that helps a careful reader of Villon to realize most vividly and accurately what Villon means in truth by the scores of otherwise obscure passages in his extremely personal and extremely local descriptions, mentions, and allusions. To attempt to read Villon without Champion to guide would be in most cases to rely on meagre or colourless information and, in many cases, to wander in the dark. His two volumes constitute in fact a rich commentary on all Villon's extant poems. Open Champion and you will find, for example, not merely a satisfying word-picture of Saint-Benoit le Bétourné, where Villon lived with his "plus que père," but the church and its cloister are put before your eyes in two excellent plates; so that cemetery of the Holy Innocents where Villon and his contemporaries met so often to gossip or ponder among the graves and heaps of bones; you can go down to the *Abrouvouer Popin* among the washerwomen, or contemplate the palace of Robert d'Estouteville or inspect either of the two thick-walled buildings where Villon was legally detained; the very stained-glass window in which Villon's mother, *povrette et ancienne*, who didn't know A from B, saw with fear

Paradis paint, ou sont harpes et lus,
Et ung enfer ou dampnez sont boullus:—

is identified. If you really are inquisitive as to that queen who had Buridan put in a bag and dumped, not into the Seine but onto a shock-absorbing heap of hay that this last of her lovers had caused to be strewn in the invisible barge that lay waiting under her window to receive him, you will find the whole

legend—all that any one need know of it—in Champion. Villon's *Rommant du Pet au Deable* has disappeared not less irretrievably than Echo or Hellois, but Mr. Champion does his best to compensate posterity for the loss by reproducing in its entirety a detailed program of a student revelry like that which must have been held, with acts of violence, arrests, and trials when Villon and others triumphantly removed Mlle de Bruyères's precious meteorite, or whatever it may have been. To the *Pet au Deable* Gaston Paris could devote only three pages of his *Villon* (1901); Mr. Champion could afford eleven and they are twice as capacious. Mr. Champion's two volumes contain no evidence that he felt cramped at any point; occasionally, it must be said, this agreeable guide slackens his pace unduly (considering the lively interest which he has maintained till that moment), and we often find ourselves back at some tavern—*le Mouton*, for example—or other "sight" whose history is repeated, at least in part, as if there had been no previous presentation. So it is with the men and women who had, or may have had, some connection with Villon; and so it is also with numerous psychological estimates, moral or artistic appraisals, etc. Had Mr. Champion made his admirable index not merely to help his readers, but to use for his own benefit before sending his book to press, he would have been able to check up his numerous repetitions and to cut them all out. Such a trimming would have enabled him to deal rather minutely with various important matters which he has hardly even touched. For example—

Mr. Champion often quotes from unexploited sources of many kinds passages which show clearly how a given word or phrase employed obscurely by Villon is to be understood, but to Villon's language as a whole he grants only a few scattered remarks, based, not upon systematic study, but upon such impressions as an intelligent reader may gather *en route*. At the present writing, we have no ready means of knowing to what degree Villon's French differs from that of other verse-makers of his time; worse still, although Villon is considered, in France and elsewhere, to be the most gifted

lyric poet of his time in all Europe, and though he is read by many persons (including specialists) who find his language difficult or misunderstand it, nobody has published even a good glossary to his 3161 verses. What they deserve and must have, if we are to read Villon comfortably, accurately, what we must have before any competent judge can venture a respectable estimate of Villon's style (whatever that may be), is a complete lexicon, accompanied by a purely linguistic commentary packed with relevant quotations from many other writers of his time, including the anonymous authors of legal documents, etc. Such a commentary and such a lexicon might enable us to judge discreetly whether a given word or locution was living or archaic, prosaic or poetical, plebeian or refined, technical or universal, normal or freakish, etc.

Again (I, 201), Mr. Champion seems to think that certain rimes of Villon's belong to "the street," though they may be duplicated easily in various poets of that time and earlier who were not trying for "realistic" or comic effects. Whatever may be its intrinsic interest, the quotation from Henry Estienne is misleading: that this Hellenist, writing a century after Villon, considered it ridiculous to say "*mon frere Pierre*," etc., proves nothing except that he thought so; if Mr. Champion, or any one else, will reread Villon he will find that in the poet's most solemn verses, where he is certainly not putting in "local colour," we meet rimes which would have been thought equally characteristic of the street fifty or a hundred years later. Villon's versification has not yet been made the subject of methodical study, so far as I am aware.

Before any such linguistic investigation of Villon is undertaken we should know where we stand as to the oldest texts. "*Les sources principales du texte de Villon*," say Messrs. Longnon and Foulet (1914), "*sont au nombre de cinq*"—to wit, four mss. and Pierre Levet's edition (1489). They add: "*Il paraît impossible d'établir la filiation de ces sources principales. On ne peut cependant méconnaître d'une part la communauté d'origine de A, B et F, et de l'autre la parenté de C et I [I=*

Levet].” All that Mr. Champion can say on this head is that “Autant que le permettent les manuscrits de Villon, qui ne sont pas excellents et ne se classent pas très bien, on peut dire que la récente édition d’Auguste Longnon [1912] nous donne un texte aussi parfaitement établi que possible: les quelques vers douteux [more than that!] de notre poète ne paraissent pas devoir être corrigés de sitôt, et sans l’aide de sources nouvelles.” Unfortunately, neither this little edition of 1912 and 1914, notwithstanding its obvious merits, nor any other, enables us to know precisely how any of the old texts reads at every point; so that the best we can do is to accept the 1914 edition, completing it and checking it up with that of the elder Longnon (1892), or refer to the facsimile of the Stockholm ms. (F). Although the edition by Messrs. Longnon and Foulet exhibits throughout that familiarity with fifteenth-century usage which we should expect from its editors, in many cases its text arouses doubt. For example, does any of the five principal sources contain the form *si* (=if) printed in vss. 583 and 784 of *Le Testament*? Nowhere else in Villon, as Messrs. L. and F. give him to us, does this *si* occur. Again, *i* for *il* or *ilz* is frequent in nearly all the fifteenth-century mss. and printed books that I have examined, yet this edition does not contain even one example.

So limited is my space that Mr. Champion’s estimates of Villon’s character, of the significance of his work, etc., cannot be considered; they will probably impress most of Mr. Champion’s competent readers as judicious and as interesting. (See, e. g., I, vi-viii, I, 194 and II, 284-7.) The declaration that “Villon demeure le seul poète du moyen âge qu’on lise aujourd’hui” (I, viii) is easy to disprove: Dante is read by thousands, outside the school-rooms, the same is true of our own Geoffrey Chaucer, and Suchier’s critical edition of *Aucassin et Nicolette* is widely read, as well as the two admirable translations by Bourdillon and Andrew Lang in English, and the delightful German translation by Wilhelm Herz. In such a work as Mr. Champion’s, all purely rhetorical, or too personal, or too national (I

mean, provincial!) statements are conspicuously out of place.

DETAILS.

I, 24. Mr. C. modernizes *Sur le Noel* (L. vs. 10) to “*Sur la Noel*.”

I, 47. For “*Coula*” read *coule* (P. D., vs. 24).

I, 49. Mr. C. translates *lubres*, in *Travail mes lubres sentemens* (T., vs. 93) by “*Instables*.” (L. & F.: *glissant, instable*.) Is this so certain? Does *lubres* come from *lubricus* or from *lugubris*?—Again, can we be so sure as is Mr. C. that *Esguisez comme une pelote* (other texts, not quoted by L. & F., but by Longnon 1892, read *Agusez ronds, Agusez rons*) means “*Arrondis comme une boule*”? Is not *Esguisez* very dubious? and may not *pelote* designate a refreshing game called *pelote* (Spanish: *pelota*)?

I, 54 n. 2, 72 n. 3, 88 n. 1, 216 n. 3, we read “*Recueil général de fabliaux*.”

I, 107. For *suit*, in T. vs. 1622, *Je suis paillart, la paillarde me suit*, Mr. C. substitutes “*duit*” and translates: “*Me convient*.” By what authority?

I, 153. In vs. 1573 (T) Mr. C. adopts the “easier reading” *filles advenantes*. Why not keep the *lectio difficilior* (hence more probable reading) *filles ennementes*, adopted and explained by L. & F.?

I, 155. Commenting on *Les mendiants ont eu mon oye* (T. vs. 1649), Mr. C. concludes that either this was a proverbial way of speaking or Villon must have seen *Pathelin* performed as early as 1460, “ce qui n’est guère vraisemblable.” Again commenting on this verse (II, 165), Mr. C. says (note 2): “G. Paris (*Romania*, XXX, 392) a adopté le point de vue de Marcel Schwob qui trouvait dans ce legs un souvenir du trait bien connu de *Pathelin* (antérieur dans ce cas à 1461): *Et si mangerez de mon oye* (v. 300). J’avoue ne pas partager cette opinion. Faire *manger de l’oe* est ailleurs employé par l’auteur de *Pathelin*, comme une façon proverbiale de dire: *berner quelqu’un* (Ed. Schneegans, v. 1577. Cf. *Les oisons mainent les oes paistre*, v. 1587). Et il y a par contre dans le *Pathelin* des souvenirs du *Testament* (v. 367, 747). L’admirable farce paraît bien dater de la seconde partie du règne de Louis XI et n’a rien à voir avec Villon.”

In a monograph to be published in the Elliott Monographs, I expect to be able to show that *Pathelin* was composed and probably performed for the first time in the spring or sum-

mer of 1464. With Mr. C.'s refusal to believe that Villon had seen *P.* performed as early as 1460, or thereabout, I therefore agree. Furthermore, it seems extremely probable that vs. 367 of *P.* (*sil nest blanc comme ung sac de plastre*) may echo Villon's *Plus qu'un sac de plastre n'est blanc* (*J. et J.*, vs. 12); but that *oncq lart es pois ne cheut si bien* can be likewise connected with Villon's *pois au lart* (*L.* vs. 191), I do not believe, for this is merely the name of a commonplace dish and is not used by Villon to express fitness, as it is used in *P.* Almost needless to add, *P.* cannot date from the "second part of the reign of Louis XI" (1461-83), for it is unmistakably alluded to in a legal document of 1469.

I, 196. Why a comma after *pesante*? (*T.* vs. 1134; same error in *L. & F.*). And in vs. 1138 why *prins en un piege*? Is not the only original reading *prins a un piege*? Furthermore, in vs. 1140, does not *miege* (*moy qui suis son miege*) contain a pun, and mean not only "Son médecin (qualificatif amené par j'ordonne)," but signify also "tawer, dresser of white leather" (a definition which I have read in some old work but can no longer find)? Again, I would suggest that by his *Que ces mastins ne sceussent courre* (*T.* vs. 1139) Villon means, in effect: (And) provided the big dogs couldn't run down the wolves and tear their hides so as to make them impossible to wear. What Mr. C. understands is merely that furriers are not accustomed to use wolfskins, though he adds that the *fourrure* or *peau* "des loups avait la précieuse vertu de vous préserver des poux, des punaises et d'autre vermine encore;" and he adds: "on avait observé que les chiens se gardaient de pisser dessus."

I, 212. In quoting, Mr. C. usually translates obscure words or obscure locutions, but he has no comment for *oeufs . . . perdus* (*T.* vss. 251-2), and all that Longnon 1892 has to say is: "On connaît encore aujourd'hui, & sous les mêmes noms, ces trois manières d'accommoder les œufs." What are, or what were, *oeufs perdus*?

I, 241. Mr. C. misquotes thus:

Parler n'en oit qu'il ne s'en rie (Read: *qui ne*)
Comme enraigé, a plaine gorge.

I, 266, note 2. Instead of "*L.*, v. 165" read: *L.*, v. 175.

I, 273. The *qui pourra prendre* of *L.* vs. 165, meaning "if anyone," etc., is not well explained by "Sous-entendu *J. Trouvé*." The correct interpretation of this *qui* upsets part of the conclusion drawn by Mr. C.

I, 274. What does Villon mean (literally) by *franc* in *le Mouton franc et tendre* (*T.* vs. 162)? Mr. C. remarks: "Que le mouton soit 'franc et tendre,' c'est là encore ce que les chambrières devaient recommander tous les jours à l'irascible boucher." In a footnote Mr. C. quotes a passage containing *Esse cy d'ung bien franc mouton*? but does not explain. (*L. & F.* likewise seem to take the interpretability of this *franc* for granted.)

I, 290, note 2. Mr. C. says *reau* (*T.* vs. 1026) was pronounced "rot" (Why not simply *ro*?), but in Villon's verse it must be dissyllabic.

Vss. 1022-9 contain a puzzle: Shall we read *Quoy que marchande ou ait estat* (with *L. & F.*)? or *Quoyque* [sic] *Marchant l'ot pour estat* (with Mr. C.)? or otherwise? Mr. C. says: "Il faut corriger vraisemblablement comme je l'ai fait ce vers: Ythier Marchand, en effet, a déjà reçu en legs l'épée de Villon (*L.*, v. 83. Cf. *T.*, v. 971)." This is true; it is true also that in Villon and other fifteenth-century writers *quoy que* is often followed by an indicative. But, how or why should Marchand have got Villon's *branc* "pour estat"?

II, 139. "Lui, pauvre mercier de Rennes,"—in reality, *Moy, povre mercerot de Renes*, (*T.*, vs. 417). *L. & F.* translate: *colporteur*.

II, 140, note 1. For "ai" read: *aie*. (Let me remark, parenthetically, that Mr. C.'s two volumes, notwithstanding their length, contain very few misprints and almost no inaccurate quotations or erroneous references.)

II, 212. Mr. C. regards as realistic Villon's detailed description of death (*T.* vss. 313-24). That the various horrors enumerated by Villon are, in most respects, anything but the result of his own terrified imaginings, or, to be on the safe side, that they correspond in their most striking features to genuine physical phenomena, is more than dubious. The truth is, I think, that the whole passage in question is fantastic and that it must be connected with many other purely fantastic medieval descriptions of death, in paintings, etc., and in books. Maeterlinck has allowed himself to indulge in the same sort of thing (see *La mort*). Persons desirous of finding out the truth will do well to consult credible authorities, as physicians, hospital attendants, etc. I will refer the readers of this review to Dr. Osler's letter in *The Spectator*, Nov. 4, 1911. In a word, this passage in Villon is not at all what Mr. C. takes it for.

II, 246. In a footnote on the verse *Prince, trois jours ne vueillez m'escondire* (*P. D.*, vs. 31), Mr. C. writes: "Refuser d'entendre ma

requête. Le mot est de style." First, *m'escondire* means simply "refuse me"; second, I doubt that "le mot est de style"; this is precisely one of those assertions which are always rash when no evidence is offered to prove them.

II, 275. "Villon devint aussi rapidement le type populaire de l'escroc, comme Pathelin. Il est remarquable de voir que l'imprimerie répandit dans le même temps l'admirable farce et le *Testament*. On écrira bientôt le *Testament de Pathelin*: ces deux œuvres seront confondues dans une même personnalité. On dira les hoirs Villon, les hoirs Pathelin." Le Roy's *Pathelin* was printed in 1485 or 1486. Pierre Levet's Villon appeared in 1489 (the first known edition); his *Pathelin* followed it within a few months. Mr. C. is right in coupling the two characters; both of them (Villon and Pathelin) had become fictitious types before 1500. What Mr. C. does not suspect is that Guillaume Alecis, whose familiarity with Villon's writings he indicates in a note, was probably the author of that "admirable farce" wherein Villon (the Villon of legend) is more or less present, with his jargon.

The pleasant chapter on "La légende de François Villon" (II, 260-93) could easily have brought Mr. C. down to the year 1914 and have taken him to England, America, and perhaps elsewhere; let us be grateful to him for giving us so much for an earlier period.

Mr. C.'s biographical appendix (II, 295-398) should become part of a *Dictionary of Proper Names and Notable Matters in the Works of François Villon*, and this should follow the complete *Commentary* and complete *Lexicon* to a generously constructed *Critical Edition*. How long shall we have to wait?

R. T. HOLBROOK.

Bryn Mawr College.

Milton and Jakob Boehme. A Study of German Mysticism in Seventeenth-Century England. By MARGARET LEWIS BAILEY. In *Germanic Literature and Culture, A Series of Monographs*, edited by JULIUS GOEBEL. New York, Oxford University Press, 1914. 8vo., vii + 200 pp.

In recent years considerable interest has been manifested in the German mystics of the Middle Ages from the view-point of theology and

philosophy. In Germany attempts have been made to popularize, by the publication of inexpensive editions, some of the works of Seuse, Boehme, Mechtild von Magdeburg, and Eckehart (vide *Sammlung Kösel* and *Die Fruchtschale*). However, little enough has been done to trace out in how far this mysticism has been a leaven in literature. The above work, the first of a series of monographs on Germanic literature and culture, edited by Professor Goebel of the University of Illinois, is therefore of vital interest. The writer purposes to show a relation between Milton and Boehme, not by the usual method of comparison for resemblances, but rather, as she says in her Preface, by attempting "to lay hold of the spirit of the time that produced natures so sympathetic and complementary as those of the simple, uneducated Görlitz shoemaker and the cultured man of the world, friend of a rising republic." Delightful as such laying hold of the spirit of the time may be, it after all offers but an insecure basis upon which to draw scientific conclusions about the actual relationship between Milton and Boehme.

In Chapter I (Introduction) is presented briefly the rise of mysticism from its Neoplatonic beginnings to Jakob Boehme. Chapter II, "English Mysticism Before Boehme," sets forth how a mystical atmosphere had been created in England by Anabaptists, Brownists, Familists, and other sects, thus preparing the way for the reception of Boehme. We learn, too, that other mystics, Tauler, Seuse, and Ruysbroeck, were not unknown in England. Is it not just as likely then that Milton may have come in touch with the mystical ideas of these sects and these men? By far the most illuminating part of the work is Chapter III, "Boehme in England," in which the introduction of Boehme's works into England, the spread of Boehmenistic teachings there, and their similarity to those of the Quakers in regard to the "inner light," are adequately presented. Having become liberally acquainted with the introduction and spread of German mysticism in England, the reader now passes to Chapter IV, "Milton and Boehme," in the joyful anticipation of an intimate relationship,

and then suffers his first keen disappointment. The purpose of this chapter appears to be to show Milton's connections with Hartlib, Comenius, Haak, and other Germans then active in England, men from whom Milton might have learned about Boehme. It is hardly correct to assume that it was always Boehme who molded the mystical tendencies of these men. It would be interesting to know to what extent Comenius, who, it will be remembered, was a member of the *Unitas Fratrum*, and later one of its bishops, had disseminated the pietistic doctrines of the Moravian Church during his stay in England. The chapter closes with the rather indefinite conclusions that Milton might have seen German copies of Boehme's works brought to England by fugitives from the Thirty Years' War, that he might have read them in English after 1644, and that it is very unlikely that Milton heard no mention of Boehme among his German friends. On this basis the writer then proceeds in Chapter V to show a similarity between Milton and Boehme in religious, philosophical and political ideas. The writer points out Milton's acceptance of the belief in the "inner light" (a favorite idea in Boehme) as marking a change in Milton's earlier and later poetry and quotes

So much the rather thou, Celestial Light,
Shine inward, and the mind through all her powers
Irradiate.

(*Paradise Lost*, III, 51 ff.)

It is interesting to note here that Mr. Sampson, in *Studies in Milton and an Essay on Poetry* (New York, 1913), in illustrating this doctrine of the "inner light," quotes this very passage as one Milton had in common with George Fox and his followers.

The writer points out as first evidence of Milton's interest in Boehme his choice of the origin of evil as the full subject of his *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*. Milton's views are then compared with Boehme's on (1) God—*prima materia*; (2) God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; (3) creation of angels; (4) origin of evil; (5) creation and fall of man; and (6) place of punishment. It is pointed out that Boehme has taught most impressively Christ's

salvation of man by overcoming temptation, that it was Christ's resistance to temptation which was the determining factor in the salvation of mankind and not the atonement upon the cross. This idea of the regeneration of mankind through Christ's resistance to temptation is given a prominent place in *Paradise Regained*, but it is hardly correct to say that "there is no other source than Boehme from which he could have obtained this idea of the temptation." Christ's sinlessness as an atonement for the sins of mankind, known in theology as the Active Obedience of Christ, over against the Passive Obedience—His passion on the cross, is not at all new, but can be traced back to Pauline theology: "For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous" (*Romans*, 5:19). This has become a part of the Lutheran doctrine, with which Milton could easily have been familiar. It may be well to recall that Boehme himself was an orthodox Lutheran all his days!

Architecturally the work is not happily planned. The longest chapter, the richest in content, and the one for which the book should have been named, is the third, "Boehme in England," whereas the fourth, which bears the title of the book, is next to the shortest and the least satisfying. As a study of the extensive spread of Boehmenism in England the work deserves commendation; as a specific study of Milton's relations to Boehme the evidence it brings carries little conviction.

PRESTON A. BARBA.

Indiana University.

CORRESPONDENCE

GREENE AND GASCOIGNE

The numerous indebtednesses of Robert Greene have been the subject of much comment. Permit me to call attention to another of Greene's sources. His "pleasant discourse, how a wife wanton by her husbands gentle

warning, became a modest Matron" (Works, ed. Grosart, Vol. X, p. 256, A Disputation Betweene a Hee and a Shee Conny-Catcher, 1590) is taken from a tale in Gascoigne's "The Adventures of Master F. J." 1573 (ed. W. C. Hazlitt, Vol. I, p. 473).

JOHN CLARK JORDAN.

The University of Illinois.

ABRAHAM CUPID

Referring to Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, Act II, Sc. 1, line 13, one finds the expression *Abraham Cupid*—a reading frequently altered by editors to read *Adam Cupid* in order to make sense out of a reading that seems to be devoid of real meaning. On the basis of the following evidence (although it is not sixteenth-century evidence), I prefer to keep the original reading and to interpret the expression as meaning simply *naked Cupid*.

According to the *New Eng. Dict.*, *Abrahamman* was in 1561 a cant term for beggar—a "bare-armed and bare-legged" vagabond—and possibly had its origin in the parable of the beggar in Luke XVI. It was the custom of such vagabonds to attract attention by saying *Tom's a-cold* (as Edgar does in *Lear*) with obvious reference to their nakedness. This connotation seems to have survived as late as the middle of the eighteenth century, for in the beggar's vernacular of that period I find *Abram* denoting *nakedness*. My authority for this statement is a dictionary of the cant language found in the sixth edition of the *Apology for the Life of Bampfylde Moore Carew, King of the Beggars*,¹ in which *Abram* is defined as meaning, "naked, without clothes, or scarce enough to cover the nakedness."

Without overlooking the necessity for discovering sixteenth-century substantiation of this assumption, I am inclined to believe that it is reasonable to accept the expression *Abra-*

ham Cupid as meaning *naked Cupid*,² especially when one considers that it is customary to represent Cupid as being nearly naked.

GERARD E. JENSEN.

Cornell University.

WINTHROP AND CURTIS

In the introduction to a new edition of Theodore Winthrop's *The Canoe and the Saddle* (1913), edited and published by Mr. John H. Williams of Tacoma, Washington, I find the amazing statement that "Curtis did not know Winthrop as an author" when he wrote the biographical sketch of Winthrop which appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* for August, 1861. The two men were near neighbors and intimate friends for several years, Curtis had already made some success as an author and some reputation as an editor, and it would have been very strange if, after Winthrop had fallen in battle, he had not looked into Winthrop's manuscripts before writing the sketch. He certainly knew *Our March to Washington* and *The Heart of the Andes*, both already published, and as we see from the following letter, *Love and Skates*, the best seller of any of Winthrop's books—a charming novelette. The above-mentioned Mr. Williams, in a most astonishing pamphlet (cf. *N. Y. Nation*, 26 February, 1914, *Notes*), assumes that Curtis did not know *Cecil Dreeme*, *John Brent*, and *Edwin Brothertoft* simply because he did not quote them. He referred to them, though not by name—for the names were all altered before publication,—and quoted only a few apposite sections of Winthrop's correspondence from the front, and some uncompleted notes for a military article for the *Atlantic*. A critic rarely quotes from unpublished writings for illustrative purposes—he quotes from material with which his readers are presumably familiar—because he is a critic, not a propagandist or advertiser; and it was perhaps for this reason

² The editors of *The 'First Folio' Shakespeare* (T. Y. Crowell & Co., New York) arrive at the same conclusion.

¹ London, Goadby and Owen, 1765.

that he did not quote from manuscript, not even from *Love and Skates*, which he had certainly seen and which is the most clearly achieved of Winthrop's work. The following letter is of interest, concerning *Love and Skates* and also concerning Mr. Curtis's attitude and character:¹

NORTH SHORE, S. I., Jan. 30th, 63.

Dear Mr. FIELDS.

Now that the last of Theodore's works is soon to appear, I take the liberty of expressing to you a wish which has been gaining ground with me and with all of us for a long time. It is that a proper and dignified review of his writings should be prepared for the "Atlantic" by some loving and capable hand. The newspaper and magazine notices, though laudatory enough to suit the most eager desire for praise are shallow and indiscriminating, partly from their necessary limits, partly from the kind of critic, that "the bookman" must be of course. Neither is it possible that any of them should have the knowledge that would enable them to speak of the industry and patience with which my brother wrought out his style, or the care with which he studied the accessories of his pictures! I would also suggest that, if you approve, Curtis be the person asked to do it—not only that his power as a critic and gracefulness as a writer would enable him to do ample justice to the subject—not only because he has made himself familiar with nearly every thing Theodore has written, unpublished as well as published, but also that he may have the opportunity to do justice to himself. For I find to my surprise that there are people mean enough to say that Curtis might have assisted to bring him forward as an author, and that he did not was a proof of jealousy lest he be eclipsed! And I should add that the expression "not great genius which is ever salient" in his biographical sketch has been quoted as indicating an unwillingness to give him due credit. To us who know his noble nature, his genuine admiration of Theodore's books and his joy in their success, as well as the helping hand he always holds forth to his literary brethren, this is simply absurd and ridiculous, and the mention of the fact that Theodore never showed him any of his writings but 'Love and Skates' which he immediately recommended his sending to the Atlantic, and gave him a note of introduction to Lowell to facilitate its acceptance, is sufficient answer so far as it is known, but for his own dear sake I would like it more widely known, and it might come in very properly in such an

article. Of course this is a mere suggestion; you will do as you please, and gratified as I should be by such a notice of my brother, I shall be *satisfied* with your decision either way.

I remain, Truly your friend,

E. W. WINTHROP.

The "proper and dignified review" which did appear was written by G. P. Lathrop. I have elsewhere discussed the editorship of the Winthrop books.

ELBRIDGE COLBY.

Columbia University.

ANENT JEROME AND THE SUMMONER'S FRIAR

"Ye need not stop work to inform us; we knew it ten seasons before." Kipling's monitory line is directly applicable to several of the present writer's parallels between the Second Book of Jerome's *Jovinian* treatise and sundry utterances of the Summoner's Friar (*Modern Language Notes*, January, 1915). My friend, Professor Tatlock, kindly draws my attention to Koeppel's exposition of the chief of these resemblances (*Anglia*, XIII, 178-179) and to his own mention of these in his *Development and Chronology*, pp. 101, 202. My oversight finds its only palliation in the prevailing disregard of Koeppel's evidence on this point (1891). This has been ignored by Lounsbury (1892) in his discussion of Chaucer's relation to Jerome (*Studies*, II, 292-297), by Skeat (1894) in his *Notes upon Chaucer's Summoner's Tale*, by Pollard (1899) in the footnotes of the Globe edition, and by Miss Hammond (1908) in her statement in *Chaucer*, p. 93. Mea culpa! Mea culpa! But the infection was abroad and I sinned in much company.

And now another *amende*! One passage in my article, "The Shakspearean Mob" (*Publications of the Modern Language Association*, December, 1912), which I thought all my own was the concluding comparison between Shakspeare's *Coriolanus* and Ibsen's *Enemy of the People*. Seemingly a *trouvaille*! But the striking likeness between the mob-dramas of the two authors had been pointed out years be-

¹ Published through the kindness of Mrs. James T. Fields, who states that the letter is "From Elizabeth Winthrop, Theodore's sister."

fore by my scholarly neighbor, Professor C. B. Wright of Middlebury College, in a paper published in synopsis in the *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*, 1895, pp. xxxi-xxxiii.

Everyone of us has many such tales to tell. Blessed be those—and their name is legion—who say our good things before us!

FREDERICK TUPPER.

University of Vermont.

BRIEF MENTION

The American-Scandinavian Foundation, which in 1913 established the American-Scandinavian Review, has again widened the sphere of its activity by embarking upon two new enterprises. The first of these is a series of Scandinavian Classics in translation, the second a series of Monographs. The initial monograph, *The Voyages of the Norsemen to America*, a copiously illustrated volume from the pen of William Hovgaard (xxi + 304 pp., with 83 illustrations and 7 maps), primarily concerns the historian. Of the Classics two numbers have thus far been issued, the first a volume of *Comedies by Holberg* translated by O. J. Campbell and F. Schenck (xv + 178 pp.), the second *Poems by Tegnér: The Children of the Lord's Supper* translated by Longfellow; *Frithiof's Saga* translated by W. L. Blackley (xxvii + 207 pp.). The three volumes are the product of the Merrymount Press and are excellent specimens of the book-maker's art.

For their intrinsic worth as well as for their importance to literary history the three comedies of Holberg well deserved a rendering into English. The translation is spirited and thoroughly idiomatic. The Introduction, giving a brief sketch of Holberg's career, is by Professor Campbell, who has recently published a volume on Holberg's relations to foreign literature in the Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature. It is to be hoped that further translations from Holberg will follow.

The contents of the volume dealing with Tegnér are not new, Longfellow's rendering of *The Children of the Lord's Supper* being, in fact, accessible in any one of the more complete editions of his works. The editor, Mr. P. R. Lieder, has followed the wording of the first edition. This may be doing a service to the student of Longfellow, but it was ill-advised if

the worthiest rendering of the original was sought. Even a casual glance at the more than forty alterations made in the received text shows that these represent, in nearly every case, corrections of metrically faulty lines. A special effort is made in the later form to eliminate the more flagrant instances of the spurious dactyl. Two examples must suffice. Compare "On the right hand the boys had their places" with "The boys on the right had their places"; "Which the Godlike delivered, and on the cross suffered and died for" with "Which the Divine One taught, and suffered and died on the cross for." The Introduction draws an interesting parallel between Longfellow's impressions of Sweden and the Arcadian setting of *Evangeline*.—Blackley's rendering of *Frithiof's Saga* compares favorably with the passages attempted by Longfellow.

Professor W. P. Mustard follows up his collection of the Mantuan's eclogues (noticed here in the number for January, 1912, p. 32) with an equally attractive edition of *The Piscatory Eclogues of Jacopo Sannazaro* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1914, 12mo., 94 pp.). Unless we are mistaken, this is the first appearance of these poems since the early part of the eighteenth century, and their first publication by themselves since a few years after their author's death. Yet, in spite of this apparent neglect, they have always appealed to students of Renaissance literature (see particularly Gaspary's keen appreciation of their qualities in his *Geschichte der italienischen Litteratur*) through their skillful blending of realistic description with the traditional conventions of the Virgilian pastoral, as well as by their own charms of verse and style. And now they meet with unusually happy treatment at Professor Mustard's hands. Their text has been carefully established on the basis of the sixteenth century editions, and the notes which explain the text particularly emphasize the obligations of their author to the poets of classical antiquity. Of wider interest, however, is the chapter of the Introduction where the influence of the eclogues on other writers is traced. One who has had only the three or four indications given by Torraca will be quite surprised to discover so many evidences of Sannazaro's presence in both Latin humanistic poetry and the vernacular literature of Italy, the Spanish peninsula, France and even England, a presence which made itself felt down even into the eighteenth century.

F. M. W.